DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 970 RC 012 266

AUTHOR	Fugitt, Glenn V., Ed.
TITLE	Rural Sociology in an International Context. Papers on the State of Rural Sociology in Selected Areas.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Dept. of Rural Sociology.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	141p.; Papers presented at a joint session of the Rural Sociological Society and International Rural Sociology Association (San Francisco, CA, September 1, 1978).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agricultural Education; *Area Studies; Educational History; *Foreign Countries; *Rural Areas; Rural Education; *Social Science Research; *Sociology; State of the Art Reviews; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Africa (West); Brazil; India; Iran; Japan; Middle East; *Rural Sociology

ABSTRACT

Published in order to further a better understanding of how work in the field of rural sociology is carried on in various places, the six papers describe pedagogical and research activities relating to the sociological concern for rural people in West Africa, Brazil, Iran, the Middle East, Japan, and India. Each paper describes the evolution of rural sociology in one of the six areas, the nature of that area's rural society, the institutions in the area which can or do teach and/or undertake pertinent social research, and the current status of rural sociology in the area. In addition, "The Development of Rural Sociology in West Africa" and "Position of Rural Sociology in India" note problems with personnel training and "Rural Sociology in Japan: Milestones in Development" critically compares contemporary Japanese rural sociology with the discipline in other countries. "Rural Sociology in Brazil" notes a trend toward urban studies, while "History and Development of Rural and Peasant Studies in Iran" outlines many early village studies. "State of Agricultural Social Science and Related Fields in Selected Countries of the ECWA Region" assesses the related but generally insufficient academic offerings of 42 national universities and other educational institutions in 12 Middle East countries. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED192970

Rural Sociology in an International Context

Papers on the state of rural sociology in selected areas presented at Joint Session of the Rural Sociological Society and International Rural Sociology Association, September 1, 1978, San Francisco, California.

OCT 1980
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

International Rural Sociology Association
Department of Rural Sociology
University of Wisconsin-Madison
1980

RC 012266

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

International Rural Sociology Association

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PREFACE

The main purpose of a scientific or scholarly society is to foster communication among its members, so that knowledge may be shared, and collaboration and coordination of work encouraged. With the establishment of the International Rural Sociological Association in 1976, a formal mechanism was created to bring sociologists in all parts of the world closer together. Today, most of the rural sociologists are found in Europe and North America. To encourage communication and mutual understanding, we felt the need to make available information about the history and current status of rural sociology in many other nations where active work in the field is going on.

The opportunity came with the joint session of IRSA with the Rural Sociological Society at the meeting of the latter organization in San Francisco in August, 1978. This is a collection of the papers presented at that session. They consider activities relating to the sociological concern for rural people in West Africa, Brazil, Iran, the Middle East, Japan, and India, and show that a considerable amount of activity exists under varying traditions and institutional settings.

The organizer of the session was Professor Gwyn E. Jones, of the Agricultural Extension and Rural Development Centre, Reading University, England. He asked the authors to indicate briefly the nature of their rural society, the institutions which do (or could) teach and/or undertake research on broadly sociological or anthropological aspects of their rural society, and how these have developed, with some evaluation of the present situation. Unfortunately, Professor Jones was unable to attend, and the chair of the session was Professor Herbert Kötter, of the University of Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany. Professor Kötter also served as a discussant, along with Professor George Beal, of the East-West Center, Hawaii, and Professor Harry Schwarzweller of the Department of Sociology, Michigan State University. Following the presentation of the papers, there was an active discussion of their content and implications from the floor.

The Council of the International Rural Sociology Association hopes that by making these papers available for wider circulation, there will be a better understanding of how work in this field is carried on in various places, and that this may in a small way help to encourage further development of our discipline.

Glenn V. Fuguitt
President, IRSA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Development of Rural Sociology in West Africa.....1

J. Ade Alao
Dept. of Extension Education and Rural Sociology
University of Ife
Ile-Ife, NIGERIA

The Position of Rural Sociology in India.....17

A.P. Barnabas
Indian Institute of Public Administration
Indraprastha Estate
Ring Road
New Delhi, INDIA

Rural Sociology in Japan: Milestones in Development.....30

Tetsuo Ninomiya
Dept. of Sociology
University of Kanazawa
Kanazawa, JAPAN

Rural Sociology in Brazil.....47

Jose Arthur Rios
Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro
Rua Mexico 31, sala 1701
Rio de Janeiro, RJ, BRAZIL

The History and Development of Rural and Peasant Studies in Iran.....60

Cyrus Salmanzadeh
Rural Sociology and Agricultural Extension
College of Agriculture
Jundi Shapur University
Ahvaz, IRAN

The State of Agricultural Social Science and Related Fields
in Selected Countries of the ECWA Region.....74

Salah M. Yacoub
UN ECWA
Beirut, Lebanon
c/o United Nations Headquarters
Postal Unit
New York, NY 10017

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL SOCIOLOGY IN WEST AFRICA

J. Ade Alao

INTRODUCTION

Rural sociology is a relatively young discipline which crystalized as a special field of study in the United States in the first decade of this century by the appointment by President Roosevelt of the Country Life Commission (Landis, 1940). In Europe, even though there had traditionally been an interest in the problems of rural social organization, rural sociology did not actually come to life until after the World War II (Kotter, 1967; see also Galpin, 1938; Smith, 1940; Kaufman, Polson and Ramsey, 1964). For many countries in Africa the development of rural sociology has yet to begin, either as an important discrete area of research interest to scholars or as an academic discipline.

WEST AFRICAN RURAL SOCIOLOGY IN THE COLONIAL ERA

The development of rural sociology in Anglophone West Africa can be divided into two time periods: the colonial and post-colonial eras. The first period (which coincides with the period of British Colonial Administration in this region) was characterized solely by individual sporadic research efforts with some rural sociological content.

According to Lucy Mair (1965) much research in social anthropology in Africa during the periods between the World Wars was financed partly by the Rockefeller Foundation and partly by direct awards of fellowships to individuals and also through contributions to the International Africa Institute. At the end of World War II, there was a favorable change in the policy of the British Government toward financing research in the "overseas dependent territories." This led to the establishment of the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund in which an annual subvention of about half a million pounds (with subsequent increases) was

made available for the social sciences--social anthropology, history, administration--and also linguistics. Grants were made to individuals in the form of fellowships and to research institutes in Africa.

In 1948 following a minority report on Ashby's Commission, a University College of London was established in Ghana and one also in Nigeria. Like other regional research institutes, the West African Institute for Social and Economic Research was set up in close association with the University Colleges located in Ibadan. There was a sister institute for East Africa which was located at Makerere in Uganda. When Ghana became independent in 1957, the policy of the new Ghanan government did not favor many of the regional institutions created by the erstwhile colonial administration. The regional institutes became national institutes; consequently, in 1956 the West African Institute for Economic and Social Research located in Ibadan became the Nigerian Institute for Social and Economic Research.

Among the scholars--social anthropologists, economists or social scientists--who made significant contributions to the foundation of research in rural sociology in West Africa are Peter Lloyd whose studies include: "The Integration of the New Economic Classes into the Local Government in Western Nigeria" (1955), "Some problems of Tenancy in Yoruba Land Law," and two books: The Yoruba Land Law (1962) and Africa in Social Change (1967).

The work of Prothero (1957) includes "Land Use at Soba, Zaria Province, Northern Nigeria" (1957) and also "Migratory Labour from North Western Nigeria" (1957) which was a study of men who seek employment away from home during agriculturally slack periods of the year.

Baldwin (1958) wrote his book on the Niger Agricultural Project, an exposition on the problems of planned social change and the possible outcomes of unintended consequences of planned change.

Pauly Hill wrote the "The Gold Coast (Ghana) Cocoa Farmers," (1956); Galleti,

Baldwin and Dina (1956) wrote on the "Nigerian Cocoa Farmers." Both studies combine economics with rural sociology. Under the auspices of the United Kingdom Research Studies in 1955, M. G. Smith did research on the Economy of Hausa Community in Zari, Northern Nigeria. The first available research work on voluntary association in West Africa was written by Kenneth Little in 1955. C. K. Meek, under the auspices of the United Kingdom Colonial Research Studies wrote Land Tenure and Land Administration in Nigeria and the Cameroons (1957), while T. O. Elias wrote the book Nigerian Land Law and Custom in 1951. Between 1949 and 1957, C. W. Rowling carried out extensive studies on land tenure which discussed the Kano, Plateau, Ondo and Ijebu Provinces in Nigeria. Kenneth Little carried out ethnographic studies of the Mende in Sierra Leone (1951) which emphasized social change, and there were several articles based on the study dealing with different aspects of social change. In Gambia during this same period, Haswell studied the economics of agriculture in Savannah country in relation to social organization and labor resources of Mandinka Village.

POST-COLONIAL ERA

The 1960s decade was one of political independence for many African countries; it also represents the beginning of the second era in the development of Rural Sociology in this region. The years following immediately after independence showed a decline in the research front due to three important factors:

First, the research funds which had come from the United Kingdom Colonial Social Science Research Council "dried up" and the financing of the social science research institutes was left to the hands of the new nation-states which since then have had to provide funds internally for their operations. It was obvious that some of the new nations could not afford the same level of funding as in the years preceding independence. Even where the outside funds were still available they could only be awarded as research fellowships to either the mem-

bers of staff in the British universities with research interests on Africa, or to those British nationals who were working in West Africa at the time. Whatever the case, such researchers were no longer accountable to the African Social Science Research Institutes for their disbursement of research funds nor were they obliged to make copies of their research results available to these institutes.

Second, at the coming of independence, most colonial administrators including secondary and university teachers, principals of schools, and research fellows in the research institutes, decided for personal, political, and economic reasons to take a lump-sum compensation of gratuity for serving in the colonies and left the services of the new nations carrying with them their completed (and uncompleted) research work. However, a few of these remained to continue their work under the new regimes.

The third important factor is that there were few nationals of the newly independent African countries who had university educations, and very many fewer of those had advanced degrees in the social sciences with adequate research competency to push forward the frontiers of research. In the 1950s most of the indigenous social scientists in West Africa were still being trained. Such people include Assimene, Busia and Danquatix in Ghana; Fadipe, Oluwasanmi, Okedeji, Oloko and Aboyade in Nigeria. These persons were, at best, research fellows, assistant lecturers, or lecturers in the early years of the independence decade. Only a few of these early scholars were referred to as sociologists or regarded themselves as such.

The man who could be regarded as the father of sociology in West Africa was the late N. A. Fadipe, a product of British and American sociological traditions. He obtained his M.A. degree from Columbia University probably during the second half of 1920s. According to Akinwowo (1976) Fadipe may have been exposed to the works of Robert MacIver and Brunner. These scholars were said to have produced textbooks identified with Columbia University during Fadipe's time at Columbia. Fadipe

taught at Achmota College between 1932 and 1935 from where he returned to the London School of Economics. In 1939, Fadipe completed a one thousand page manuscript for his Ph.D. dissertation on "The Sociology of the Yoruba." This was almost a decade before any University College was established in West Africa. This important work, a microsociological analysis of the Yoruba people, was published posthumously by Okedeji and Okediji in 1970.

The oldest University College in West Africa is only about 30 years old now. Those who were concerned with sociological teaching and research in the early years of this institution did so under the umbrella of a recognized social science disciplines such as economics, anthropology or African studies. This was so even until recently. The University of Ibadan, the oldest institution of higher learning in Nigeria, has produced only two Nigerian professors of sociology, Ife University has produced one, and the University of Lagos two, while Nsukka and ABU have not yet produced one. The department of sociology in Ghana is said to be as old as the University itself, but the fact that sociology as an academic discipline is taught in the schools of Nursing, Home Science, Social Administration and Prison Administration has tended to blur the distinctiveness of theoretically grounded sociology in that country (Assimieng 1976, p. 112).

In a recent article,Akinwowo (1976) said that because sociology is an important field of knowledge in Nigeria its acceptance, present status, and possibly its future development are affected: "...most people including some University and Government Administrators...have looked askance at anyone who claimed to be a sociologist."

In a recent article by Ikong (1976) it was suggested that several factors may account for the present state of sociology in Africa. These are:

(1) the fact that very few Africans have been trained in the field of sociology to adequately propagate or popularize the discipline;

(2) the few that had been trained have mostly been trained outside Africa or

their immediate social environment. Some of these are either unable or unwilling to translate their foreign training to solve problems of local conditions;

(3) most African sociologists tend to gravitate to the Universities where they can teach and conduct research in the custom and tradition in which they were brought up in the subject;

(4) research conducted by African sociologists also tend to reflect the sociological traditions and requirements of the "founding nations."

Not only does the African sociologist believe that he must share the theoretical stance of his colleagues and professors to be internationally recognized, but also because their employers in Africa demand that they must publish in "international" journals, join "international" professional associations, etc. for their works to be recognized as scholarly and of "international" standard;

(5) the teaching of sociology in Africa has depended not only upon foreigners, foreign-trained and Westernized Africans, but largely on foreign textbooks, the contents of which are outdated and irrelevant;

(6) a certificate or diploma in sociology does not immediately suggest to the job-seeker which employer to apply to, neither does it in fact suggest to the prospective employer a specific assignment for the employee.

At this point I would like to relate briefly how my own interest in rural sociology began and then to continue the discussion of the development of the rural sociology curriculum in the universities in West Africa. In my penultimate year as an undergraduate student of Agriculture at the University of Ibadan in the 1962-63 academic year, we were told that a new course had been added to the curriculum. This new course was to be taught by a new member of staff in the Faculty of Agriculture, a Briton who was based in the Department of Agricultural Organization in the Faculty of Agriculture. The new instructor

had ten years working experience as an Agricultural Officer in Britain in addition to his B. Sc. degree in Agriculture. His appointment was made possible by a grant to the Department of Agricultural Organization by UNICEF. The course was labelled Agricultural Extension Education but dealt in the main with Adoption Process/Diffusion Process. The only reference text we had at that time was E. M. Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations.

When the British instructor left at the end of that year, a Dutchman was recruited who, we were told, was a rural sociologist. It was he who introduced my class to some basic concepts in sociology such as social groups, social interaction, and formal and informal social organizations. Due to his poor mastery of English at the time, his lectures did not make much sense to most of us. In spite of the fact that I tried very hard to keep up with him, I took fewer than three pages of lecture notes during the term of twelve to fourteen weeks. Since there were optional courses, many of my colleagues did not care to understand such a preoccupation with an "abstract" and esoteric" subject.

Due to the high quality of my performance in the degree examination in June 1964 and in particular in social science subjects, the Department of Agricultural Organization under the leadership of Prof. Oluwasanmi requested my release from the Federal Government Civil Service for further training in Extension Education and Rural Sociology with a view of my joining the staff of the Department at the completion of my training. I was admitted to Cornell University in January 1965. Because of the close relationship between the Department of Rural Sociology and Extension Education at Cornell, Rural Sociology was my second subject, but I took more courses in the Departments of Sociology and Rural Sociology than in Extension Education. Consequently, at the completion of my Masters degree program, I changed my department to become a major in Rural Sociology. While I was away for my studies in the United States there

was no one to teach rural sociology at the University if Ibadan. In fact, I had to return to Nigeria on the completion of my Master's degree for two years precisely because of this. From 1966 to 1972, Rural Sociology continued to be taught within the Department of Agricultural Economics at Ibadan. Only one introductory course was being taught to the second year students of Agriculture as its own contribution to a unified B.Sc. Agric. degree structure. During this period also, a service course was being offered to the students of Adult Education in the Department of Adult Education of the University of Ibadan. In 1972, the Faculty of Agriculture modified its degree structure so that students in the Faculty could specialize in subject matter areas of their choice. The Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension had Extension Education and Rural Sociology as subject matters area of specialization for that department. Also a post graduate program for the master's and the Ph.D. was established. Two years later, the Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension went through a further stage of differentiation by the creation of a Department of Agricultural Extension Services whose intent and purpose was to combine Extension Education and Rural Sociology. The Dean at the time could not persuade the Development Committee of the University to create a Department of Rural Sociology due to lack of adequate number of rural sociologists on the staff to make it a viable department, and possibly because of the opposition from sociologists in the liberal arts who might feel threatened by any new department which might take over part of their own legitimate functions. However, rural sociology continued to be taught within the Department of Agricultural Extension Services at the University of Ibadan. The undergraduate program in Rural Sociology now consists of five courses for two semesters. The graduate program consists of ten courses.

Immediately after Independence in 1960, there was a strong need to create more universities in Nigeria. Therefore in 1962, the three regional governments established one university each: the University of Ife in the West, the

University of Nsukka in the East, and the Ahmadu Bello University in the North. Each of these universities has a strong Faculty (College) of Agriculture. The University of Ife had five departments in its Faculty of Agriculture viz., Agricultural Economics, Animal Science, Extension Education and Rural Sociology, Plant Science and Soil Science. Therefore, right from the onset, Rural Sociology was recognized as an academic discipline and had favorable conditions in which to develop. Unfortunately, due to circumstances beyond our control, the department has remained a small department. At present out of seven members of academic staff of the department, two are rural sociologists. During the first ten years of existence of the Faculty, it has concentrated on offering a unified general honours degree structure in Agriculture. Therefore the Department of Extension Education and Rural Sociology has been contributing only one course in the second year to this program. This is a 3-unit course of two lectures and one hour tutorial class per week for one academic session of 40 weeks. This gives a total of 120 contact hours. However, the department has a post graduate program with a strong Rural Sociological content. The program which is based on course work and research includes core courses and optional courses in Rural Sociology.

About two years ago, the Faculty of Agriculture decided to introduce both the semester system and course-unit system and also to extend the degree program from four years to five years. With this new program came the introduction of limited specialization along departmental tracks. Under the new program, the students of Agriculture in the first three years will be taking general core courses in all departments in the Faculty. In the fourth year, they will locate in private and public commercial farms to expose them to practical problems of agriculture. During that year too, the student will be expected to undertake a research project in a special area of his choice. In the fifth year, he

will return to the Faculty to departments of his choice to take optional courses within the department and then finish with a comprehensive examination in that department . Therefore, under this new program, it has now become possible for the Department of Extension Education and Rural Sociology to increase its input of course offerings in the undergraduate program since it has its own departmental track. The department has two courses for the two semesters in the second year of the new program in addition to the single course being offered in the first part of the old program. This year the department handled about 200 students for the undergraduate courses, drawn from the Faculty of Agriculture, Departments of Sociology, Demography and Pharmacy.

A third example from Nigeria is the program of the Ahmadu Bello University of Zaria. The undergraduate program in Agriculture has passed through three phases. The first phase covered the period between 1962 and 1972 which also corresponds to the first decade of existence of the Faculty. Under this program, all students reading for the B.Sc. Agriculture degree took the same number and types of courses offered in the various departments of the Faculty.

In 1972-73 (beginning of phase II) the Faculty introduced a scheme of limited options in four borad areas of agriculture, one of which was agricultural economics along with rural sociology, and agricultural extension. This scheme, which will be operative till the 1979-80 academic year,makes it necessary for the B.Sc. (Agric.) students to devote two of the three terms in year III to the acquisition of some in- ' 'h understanding of the limited option in the area of their choice. The agricultural economics, rural sociology and agricultural extension option offered by the department under this scheme is a composite one and has a total of 228 contact hours. These contact hours are divided between agricultural economics courses (172 hours) and rural sociology and agricultural extension courses (56 hours). These contact hours are in addition to the time all students reading for the B.Sc. (Agric.) degree devote to agricultural econ-

omics (120 contact hours) and rural sociology and agricultural extension (32 contact hours).

Beginning 1977-78 (beginning of phase III), the Fa culty of Agriculture has switched over to a four-year B.Sc. (Agric.) degree program under which the department will offer two separate limited option programs of 20-week duration each, one in the general area of agricultural economics and the other in the general area of rural sociology and agricultural extension. Besides, the four-year program also provides for a substantial increase in the exposure (from 32 contact hours in the three-year program to 84 hours in the four-year program) to rural sociology and agricultural extension for all students reading for the B.Sc. (Agric.) degree. An important aspect of the four-year program is the emphasis it lays on practical experience. The department will, therefore, mount a practical training program in agricultural economics and extension in years III and IV of the four-year program.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The development of staff in the field of Rural Sociology in the higher institutions in West Africa has been very slow. As mentioned earlier, there are two with Ph.D.'s in Rural Sociology at the University of Ife, two with master's degrees at ABU, and one at the University of Ghana, Legon. The lack of staff in the field of Rural Sociology in West Africa is attributable in part to its newness both as an academic discipline and as a profession. I have searched newspapers repeatedly over the years each time the Federal or any state government in Nigeria advertises courses for which scholarships could be provided in a given year, at higher institutions, but I have always been disillusioned that rural sociology has never been included. Even several of my colleagues in the university have challenged me openly that I should be in the Faculty of S ocial Sciences rather than in Agriculture. In my own department, we have adopted a

policy of giving in-service training to our best students so that they can come back to work for the department. We hope in this way to be able to increase the rural sociology staff strength to about five in the next five years.

The Current Research Interests of the Sociologist

A cursory look at the current research interests of the rural sociology staff in these West African universities include Diffusion and Adoption Studies, Rural Social Organizations and Change, Planned Change, Rural-Urban Migration, Resettlement Studies, Appropriate Technology, Agricultural Systems and Land Tenure. Within the last ten years, about one hundred publications have emanated from my own department from all the members of staff, past and present.

In view of the very few number of rural sociologists in the region, it has not been possible to form a separate professional Association. But in 1970, the Nigerian Anthropological and Sociological Association (NASA) was inaugurated and set out as an objective the promotion of Anthropological and Sociological Research and Teaching. However, the influence of NASA is still very limited due to the rather small size of its membership. The Ghana Sociological Association sent a delegation to our annual meeting in 1976, and a Committee was set up for the establishment of a West African Sociological Association. This has not materialized because of the weakness of the national associations which have not been able to meet regularly since then. Also due to organizational and financial problems, these national associations have not been able to sustain and publish their own journals, nor have they been able to put out proceedings of their annual conferences within the past five years. In the light of this we cannot seriously claim to have viable professional associations.

Role of Rural Sociology in Nation Planning and Developments

Most African countires approach national development in the form of quinquennial plans. Nigeria and other West African countries are now in their third quinquennial development plan period since independence. To the best of my

knowledge, sociologists in Nigeria have not played an active role in the production of these national development plans. This is very unfortunate indeed because after all, national development plans are made for and on behalf of people. It is necessary that such plans should enjoy the confidence of those whose life is to be affected by it. In order to engender such confidence, the contents of the plan should reflect the wishes, needs, and aspirations of the people who are to be affected by the plan or who may be called upon to make contributions--money, talent, etc. toward the accomplishment of certain aspects of the plan. The rural sociologist can play an effective role in at least three broad areas of concern in an effort to develop an effective national development plan (Alao, 1976). The first is the development and generation of social accounts; the second is in the utilization of social data in policy formulation and in guidance of action programs; the third is the interpretations (evaluation) process of completed or on-going social programs with a view to generate further social data and to modify policy statements in the light of new experiences. Experiences from practically all countries of the world point to the socially undesirable aspects of public programs which failed to take into account sociological input at the planning and implementation of such programs. Africa cannot afford to repeat mistakes of the past.

Realizing the problem ahead as a professional group, coupled with the apparent lack of awareness of the potential contributions that rural sociology could make to national development, one is left with no other choice than to tactfully pursue recognition. Through personal contacts with the Director and Staff of the National Ministry of Rural Development and to some State Ministries of Rural Development, I am gradually pushing ahead to achieve this recognition. The Department of Extension Education and Rural Sociology at the University of Ife pioneered an integrated rural development project in about fifteen communities within a 20 kilometer radius of the University. Sister departments at

Ibadan and Zaria have started similar projects. The success story of these projects of how much one can do with so little resources but with the strong will and cooperation of people are annually documented and copies are sent to relevant government ministries, and this has helped in no small way to put the name of the departments on the map. Within the last two years, my department alone has received three requests from State Governments to carry out feasibility or evaluative studies on their behalf.

Our graduate program for the one-year Master of Science Degree for serving officers in the Ministry of Agriculture, and Rural Development is attracting more students than the department can cope with. This shows that there is hope for the future for the enhanced development of Rural Sociology in this region.

REFERENCES

Alao, J. A. 1976. The Role of the Sociologist in National Development Planning. Unpublished. Department of Extension Education and Rural Sociology, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Ife, Ile-Ife.

Akinwowo, A. 1976. "Contemporary Sociology in Nigeria" Reprinted from Handbook of Contemporary Development in World Sociology. Edited by Ray P. Mohad and Don Martindale.

Assimieng, A. K 1976. "Sociology in Ghana." Ghana Journal of Sociology Vol. II, No. 1, pp. 32 - 43. 1959.

Baldwin, K.D.S. 1958. The Niger Agricultural Project. Oxford Blackwell.

Ekong, E. E. 1976. Africanizing the Sociological Enterprise: A CAll for Relevance. Paper read at the 10th Annual Conference of Ghana Sociological Association, Legon, Ghana.

Elias, T. O. 1951. Nigerian Land Law and Custom. London: Routledge.

Fadipe, N. A. 1939. The Sociology of the Yoruba. With ...oduction by F. O. Okediji. Ibadan University Press.

Gallietti, R., K.D.S. Baldwin and I. O. Dina. 1956. Nigerian Cocoa Farmers. O. U. P.

Galpin, Charles J. 1938. "The Development of the Science and Philosphy of American Rural Society." Agricultural History XII: 195-208.

Hill, P. 1956. The Gold Coast Cocoa Farmer. Oxford University Press.

Kaufman, H. F., R. A. Polson, and C. E. Ramsey. 1964. "The Role and Function of Rural Sociology." Paper presented at the 1st World Congress for Rural Sociology. Sociological Ruralis IV: 371-384.

Kotter, Herbert. 1967. "The Situation of Rural Sociology in Europe." Sociological Ruralis. Vol. 7, 3.

Landis, Paul H. 1938. "The Development of Rural Sociology in the United States." Sociology and Social Research XXII.

Little, K. L. 1951. The Mende of Sierra Leone. London: Routledge.

Lloyd, Peter. 1953. "The Integration of the New Economic Classes into Local Government in Western Nigeria." African Affairs. Vol. 52.

_____ 1955. "The Development of Political Parties in Western Nigeria." American Political Science Review. Vol. 49.

_____ 1962. The Yoruba Land Law. Ibadan, Published for NISER by Oxford University Press (O.U.P.).

_____ 1967. Africa in Social Change. Penguin Books. Limited, England.

Mair, Lucy. 1965. "The Social Sciences in Africa. South of the Shara: The British Contribution" in AFRICA. Social Problems of Change and Conflict ed. by Pierre L. Van den Berghe pp. 15-35.

Meek, C. K. 1957. Land Tenure and Land Administration in Nigeria and the Cameroons. Landon. H.M.S. Office 1957. Colonial Research No. 22.

Prothero, R. M. 1957. "Land Use at Soba, Zaria Province Northern Nigeria." Economic Geographer Vol. XXXIII: 72-86.

_____ 1957. "Migratory Labour from North Western Nigeria." Africa Vol. XXXVII: 251-261.

Rowling, C. W. 1949. Report on Land Tenure Kano Province. Government Printer, Kaduna.

_____ 1959. Report on Land Tenure. Plateau Province. Government Printer, Kaduna.

_____ 1952. Report on Land Tenure: Ondo Province. Government Printer, Lagos.

_____ 1957. Report on Land Tenure: Ijebu Province. Government Printer, Lagos.

Smith, M. G. 1955. The Economy of Hausa Communities in Zaria, United Kingcom Colonial Research Studies 16.

Smith, T. Lynn. 1940. The Sociology of Rural Life. Harper and Brothers. N.Y., London.

THE POSITION OF RURAL SOCIOLOGY IN INDIA

A. P. Barnabas

In order to understand the status of rural sociology in India, many factors must be considered including the rurality of the country, the process of rural development and the role of rural sociology in it, as well as the training of personnel and the types of studies undertaken. This paper analyzes the position of Indian rural sociology in terms of these factors.

RURAL INDIA

India is essentially a rural country: according to the census of 1971, of the 547 million people in India, 439 million live in 560,000 villages. The Indian economy is still predominatly agricultural, with about half the national income derived from agriculture and 70 percent of the total population dependent on agriculture for their livelihood. Out of 180 million people classified as workers, 125 million are engaged in agriculture either as cultivators or agricultural laborers. Thirty-six million operational holdings are less than one hectare in size and another 13.4 million between one and two hectares. The holdings of less than two hectares account for only a small proportion of the total area under cultivation (about 15 to 20 percent). Of the 67 percent workers engaged in directly working on land, 46 percent are cultivators having rights of ownership or possession over land. The remaining 21 percent are landless agricultural laborers. The percentage of cultivators to total agricultural workers declined from 75 percent in 1961 to 60 percent in 1971, a disturbing trend. On the other hand, the percentage of agricultural laborers increased from 22 percent to 37 percent in 1971. The percentage of literacy in rural areas is about 25 percent and

among the women it is 15 percent. The hierarchical caste structure is manifest in rural areas and the lack of amenities is glaring.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Rural development has provided a major stimulus for the study of various aspects of rural life; it may not be too much claim that the sociologists in India were drawn to study the "sociology of development" as a result of various programs of village improvement.

Before independence in 1947, there were only isolated and sporadic attempts at rural development. 1952 marked a significant change in the efforts for rural development--the Community Development program launched in that year covered the whole country within a few years. It has been suggested that the community development program might be divided into three phases: 1) the adoptative administrative phase (1952-55); 2) the integrated technical phase (1956-58); and 3) the democratic decentralization phase (1959 onwards).

There was a decline in the community development programs in the late 1960s. The process of decentralization also has had setbacks, but there is now a revived effort to focus on the need to bring about development in the rural areas with attention to minimum needs, small farmers, development, marginal farmers and agricultural laborers, the whole village scheme, applied nutrition, maternity and child health, etc. The phrase "integrated rural development" has replaced the earlier "community development." Various studies were undertaken as a result of initiation of community development programs, a number of which dealt with the rural sociological structure. It was a coincidence that in early 1950s there was a spurt of village research--a significant amount carried out by Western anthropologists such as Bailey (1957), Epstein (1962, 1972), Lewis (1958), Marrot (1955), and

Mandelbaun (1970).

Community organization and communication for extension work were also explored. A few studies were related to rural leadership and people's participation. A large number of evaluations were undertaken, mostly by government organizations. With the coming of democratic decentralization, many evaluations of institutions emerged as a consequence of democratic decentralization--at the village, block and district level. In order to understand the response of the people to community development, studies of motivation were made as well as of the impact of community development on agriculture, people's attitude, rural leadership, rural culture, social relations, etc. Empirical research directly focused on process-planned change is rather limited, some of it relating to administrative institutions, the bureaucracy, the relationship between administrators, and people's institutions, etc. While they do have a bearing on rural development, they are not sociological in nature.

RURAL SOCIOLOGY AS AN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE

Rural sociology as a subject to be taught is of recent origin. It was with the emergence of emphasis on rural development and, in particular, agricultural development that a number of agricultural universities were established,[1] and it is in these institutions that rural sociology is taught. (There are no departments of rural sociology in any university.) The agricultural universities have departments of agricultural extension in which rural sociology is taught.

In other universities there are departments of sociology in which, at the master's level, quite a few of the courses taught are related to rural social structure such as rural social institutions, peasants' movements and

social stratification.

There is some problem of separating sociology from rural sociology. Because 80 percent of the people live in rural areas, any sociologist in India who wants to study contemporary societal processes in India has no alternative but to study the rural situation. In fact, the leading sociologists in India did start with studies on villages. (For example, S.C. Dube (1955, 1958), M.N. Srinivas (1960), R. Mukerjee (1957), M.S.A. Rao (1956), and A. Beteille) (1965). The general feeling among the people who are teaching the subject is that rural sociology needs more recognition as an academic discipline. Some feel that rural sociology now receives more recognition than it did about a decade ago, but it is difficult to measure its status. Since both sociologists and social anthropologists study rural social life, the question is often asked as to whether rural sociology can have a separate identity of its own especially since sociology itself is comparatively new in India.

TEACHING OF RURAL SOCIOLOGY

As noted earlier, rural sociology is taught in all the agricultural universities, both at the bachelor's and master's level. There is variation in the number of hours allocated to rural sociology. At the master's level there are universities which allocate four hours per week for a whole academic year, while there are others that give four hours per week for only one quarter. There are three or four universities which offer a Ph.D. in rural sociology--mostly in the departments of agricultural extension. The courses taught at the master's level are varied as this list of courses taught in three universities reveals:

University 1

Rural social system
Rural adult and youth organizations
Research methodology
Planned social change

University 2

Society, culture and personality
Social groups: functioning and role
Social control
Social mobility
Group dynamics and leadership
Social change

University 3

General sociology
Rural community organization
Rural social institutions
Social change
Advanced rural sociology
Contemporary social theories
Diffusion and adoptation of agricultural technology
Rural leadership

The freedom to offer different courses is essential to the growth of rural sociology; however, there is a need for a common preliminary base for the discipline.

While some agricultural universities have professorships in rural sociology, there are others in which there is no specific post for rural sociologists even at lecturer's level. Most of the persons who are teaching rural sociology were trained in India, with about one-third of teachers having earned Doctorates either in the departments of agricultural extension sociology or social anthropology. A dissertation on rural life would qualify them to teach rural sociology. (Examples of dissertation topics include social organization in a refugee population, small scale entrepreneureship, rural village social life, and rural youth.)

There are a number of rural sociologists not affiliated with universities

but with other institutions or organizations such as the National Institute of Community Development, the Indian Institute of Public Administration and the Rural Electrification Board. The persons working in these organizations tend to undertake studies of applied nature and their linkage with the universities is slight.

There are only a few persons who have obtained their Ph.D. in rural sociology. It was only in the very late sixties or early seventies that some three or four universities began to offer doctoral degrees in the field. There are very few opportunities in other programs. Although it was expected that programs of community development (now integrated rural development) would provide avenues of employment for rural sociologists, this has not proved to be so. There is need to recognize the role of sociology in the process of rural development and unless this happens, it will be very difficult to improve the status of rural sociology in India. The training in the universities at present is not adequate to enable persons studying rural sociology to function effectively in organizations which may have peripheral interest in rural sociology, as is the case in a number of organizations and programs (e.g., Health, Family Planning, Nutrition, and Housing).

The textbooks that are used in rural sociology courses are mostly from the United States, for example, those by Nelson (1955), Bertrand (1958), Sanderson (1942), Rogers and Burge (1972), Smith and Zopf (1970), and Loomis and Beegle (1950, 1957). Two Indian books frequently used are Introductory Rural Sociology by J. B. Chitambar (1973) and Rural Sociology in India by A. R. Desai (1959). Unfortunately, neither of these two books provide a suitable frame of reference for the analysis of Indian rural society. The

first book tends to be more Western-oriented in its conceptual framework--hardly any references are made to the Indian village studies. Desai's book is a book of readings with no overriding theme linking articles in the book. Some of the universities use the village studies mentioned earlier. Most of these analyze a single village and do not provide the necessary theoretical tools which would enable students of rural sociology to understand and analyze society. (Sociology in India has similar problems including its dependency on books from the West.)

STUDIES OF RURAL LIFE

It is difficult to delineate those studies which are primarily in their sociological orientation. Since both sociologists and social anthropologists also study rural life there is some overlap in research studies that are carried out. One early study, "Behind Mud Walls" by W. Wiser, was done in the early thirties with a replication by Wiser in 1960. Similarly, a longitudinal study was made by S. Epstein of two villages in South India (Economic Development and Social Change in South India" and "South India Yesterday, Today and Tommorow").

A number of anthropoligical studies of single villages were done in the early fifties by Western scholars. This participant observation approach was directed at understanding a single village in its totality. They were essentially micro-studies which attempted to study villages in different parts of the country; however, no generalizations have been made because of the large number of village studies undertaken in different parts of the country. (There were a few which investigated more than one village.) Apart from this, analyses on rural leadership, the impact of technology on rural life, adoption and diffussion, and rural social change were made.

Here also, the tendency was to study a single village, and it has not been possible to build any generalizations on the basis of these studies.

More recent efforts have considered particular aspects of a number of villages (e.g., leadership, the peasants' movement, response to development programs, intercaste relations, and the rural family). Segments of social life have been the subject of studies of a small number of villages in an effort to examine whether a particular social phenomena is operational in a similar manner in a number of villages. It is difficult at this point to evaluate whether or not these studies, as yet small in number, will lead to generalizations with regard to rural social life in India. There a large areas which have yet to be explored.

One of the major areas in which studies need to be undertaken is rural social value system. There have been a few investigations of f attitudes to change, with particular reference to acceptance of improve agricultural practices; however, the value system as such has not been studies. Whether or not acceptance of change has led to changes in the value system also needs to be examined. The process of modernization (and factors helping or hindering that process) has been only touched upon. Rural migration and its impact on the rural society is another field in which studies should be undertaken, as well as other aspects of rural demography such as fertility and the changing population composition.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Rural sociology is of recent origin in India. It is a subject taught only in agricultural universities in the Department of Agricultural Extension. On the one hand, it suffers as a result of being only a tool in agricultural extension education. On the other hand, it also suffers from not having the

recognition that sociology or social anthropology has--the problem is one of identification and recognition. Furthermore, both agricultural extension and sociology have in a sense yet to assert themselves. Generally extension education is considered an applied discipline, but there are some in the field of extension education who feel that it should be considered as a separate discipline.

Sociology in India is in a critical situation; the quest of the appropriate sociological framework in which to analyze India continues. There is the desire to understand the social structure of India in terms of universal abstractions. As one sociologist (Yogendra Singh) puts it: "The search for universalistic model of sociology has in India led always to a feeling of ambivalance among sociologists. The historical pull of Indian sociology which takes sociologists towards the search of their own specific identity and response to traditions are historic on the one hand and the objectivity of universalistic science on the other, is indicative of the contemporary tension." The rural sociologists in a sense feel this tension much more. The universalistic principles to which he can refer are principles of general sociology. The theories and models developed in the West have not been adequate to analyze the unique rural situation in India.

Rural sociologists have been busy with applied studies and have not developed any models of their own which could be tested in the Indian situation--this is the real dilemma. There are other constraints which make this dilemma critical. The personnel in rural sociology per se are few, and they are very busy responding to the immediate needs of their organizations which tend to be applied in nature. The teaching load for those affiliated with universities is quite demanding, and the funds available are rather meager.

Some discussion of a professional society for rural sociologists has taken place, but at present, they are members of the Sociological Society of India. There is an ambivalent feeling regarding a Rural Sociological Society. Some feel it is better to function through the Indian Sociological Society not only because of their small numbers but the Indian Sociological Society is concerned with rural society and already has recognition. On the other hand, some feel that unless the rural sociologists establish independence, they may not achieve sufficient status. The Sociological Society is not enthusiastic about the existence of a Rural Sociological Society. The rural sociologists, therefore, face problems on both the theoretical and organizational levels. This dilemma and its tensions are probably the most hopeful signs for rural sociology in India.

NOTES

1. There are 22 agricultural universities. Apart from these, the Indian Agriculture Research Institute, the National Dairy Research Institute, and the Indian Veterinary Research Institute all offer degrees in various fields and courses in rural sociology.

REFERENCES

Bailey, F.G. 1957. Caste and the Economic Frontier. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bertrand, Alvin Lee (ed.) 1958. Rural Sociology: An Analysis of Contemporary Rural Life. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Beteille, A. 1965. Caste, Class and Power. Bombay: Oxford University Press.

Chitambar, John Benedict. 1973. Introductory Rural Sociology: A Synopsis of Concepts and Principles. New Delhi: Wiley Eastern.

Desai, Akshayakumar Rumanial. 1959. Rural Sociology in India (Rev. ed.) Bombay: Indian Society of Agricultural Economics.

Dube, Shyama Charan. 1955. Indian Village. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul.

_____. 1978. India's Changing Villages: Human Factors in Community Development. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul.

Epstein, T.S. 1962. Economic Development and Social Change in India. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

_____. 1973. South India. Yesterday Today and Tomorrow. London: MacMillan.

Lewis, O. 1958. Village Life in Northern India. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Mandelbaum, D. 1970. Society in India. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Marrot, McKim. 1955. Village India. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mukerjee, R. 1957. Dynamics of Rural Society. Berlin: Akademie-verlag.

Nelson, Lowey. 1955. Rural Sociology. (2nd ed.) New York: American Book Co.

Rao, M.S.A. 1956. Social Change in Malabar. Bombay: Popular Prakashan.

Rogers, Everett M. and Rabel J. Burdge. 1972. Social Change in Rural Societies. (2nd ed.) New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Sanderson, Dwight. 1942. Rural Sociology and Rural Social Organization. New York: J. Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Smith, T. Lynn and Paul E. Zopf, Jr. 1970. Principles of Inductive Rural Sociology. Philadelphia: F.A. Davis Co.

Srinivas, Mysore N. 1960. India's Villages. New York: Asia Publishing House.

Wiser, W. 1964. Behind Mud Walls. Berkeley: University of California Press.

RURAL SOCIOLOGY IN JAPAN: MILESTONES IN DEVELOPMENT

Tetsuo Ninomiya

The purpose of this paper is to analyze past and contemporary Japanese rural sociology and to critically compare it with the discipline in other countries (see also Minomiya 1968, pp. 259-282; 1974, pp. 287-296).

BACKGROUND FOR DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL SOCIOLOGY IN JAPAN

In pre-World War II times, one of the central topics for the study of sociology in Japan was rural sociology as a positive as well as a theoretical study. In Japan, theories and systems were imported from Europe and America--for instance--from England, Germany, France and the United States of America at the beginning of the Meiji Era (from 1868-1912) until the Taisho Era (1912-1926) and the fifteenth year of the Showa Era (1926 until about 1940). This served primarily as an introduction to European and American sociology--the methodology and theoretical framework of the work of Spencer, von Stein, Comte, Simmel, Weber, Durkheim, Giddings, Maciver, etc. In addition to these importations, translations, and introductions, Yasuma Takada (1883-1972) founded a creative system of sociology in Japan in prewar times.

Some gathering of data about rural phenomena was carried out in prewar times which emphasized the influence of both folklore and agricultural economics.

So, during these times, we might say that the establishment of a scientific system was both anticipated and overdue.

Nihon Noson Shakaigaku Genri (Principles of Japanese Rural Sociology) by Eitaro Suzuki was the first presentation of systematic rural sociology in Japan, the source of the discipline in Japan. After Suzuki (1894-1966), many Japanese rural sociologists would repeatedly return to his system, and from there begin to take new steps. Suzuki analyzed the Japanese mura (rural community) in his study, which was also intended to establish the methodology for the subject. The research method was adopted from foreign research methods--both extensive (quantitative and statistical ones from American rural sociology) and intensive ones.

The methodology of the American rural sociologist C. J. Galpin (1864-1947) underlay the field work of Suzuki. Galpin had studied various institutions in urban business centers such as the school, the church, the bank, the library and so on, and how their services are provided for the surrounding rural area. And he found the community at the place where the various service areas accumulated, using a mapping method. He called the community rural-urban community, or rurban community. Suzuki gathered as much data as possible about rural social groups existing in Japan and he classified them as ten different kinds: a) Administrative Local Group, b) Parish Group, c) Supporters' Group, d) Religious Club Group, e) Neighborhood Group, f) Economic Group, g) Government Organization Group, h) Kin Group, i) Special Cooperative Interest Group, and j) Class Group. He showed the state of accumulation of all groups by a diagram. Then, many groups, including the most important ones, accumulated in the area called "Buraku (Hamlet)" or "Oaza (Minor Section). Moreover, a conscious uniformity controlled farmers living in this area. So, he indicated these as "Japanese Mura." He called this hamlet community "Shizen Son (Natural Village).

With this important work done, Japanese rural sociology could pass into a new stage of development. However, Suzuki also was obliged to discuss another

principle of Japanese rural sociology--whether or not the defined distinguishing characteristics of Japanese rural community, Japanese mura, were truly grounded in reality. To grasp the very character of Japanese rural society was the aim of Suzuki's thought.

Suzuki's theory was criticized by other Japanese rural sociologists who suggested that the Japanese mura which Suzuki presented did not have both historical and accurately probed authenticity. It was an unproved assertion that Japanese mura must have these characteristics since it had passed through a feudalistic system and pre-feudalistic system. They asserted that limits must be applied to Japanese rural society, as they were in Galpin's.

Hiroshi Oikawa (1967), Seiichi Kitano (1976), and Kizaemon Aruga (1943) presented the theory of dōzoku-soshiki (the Japanese extended family system). According to this theory, the dōzoku-soshiki was a group of ie (the Japanese family) connected with each other by patri-lineal relationships in an hierarchical system. One main family dominates the hierarchy, with branch families of the sons and grandsons, etc., ranking below it in status.

Could a foreigner's theoretical framework and methodology apply to the Japanese rural society? This point--a question in prewar times--continued in postwar times as well. Some problems relating to this point follow:

1. The need to clarify the homogeneity and heterogeneity in Japanese rural society as compared with European or American. There is more homogeneity in European rural society than American in the opinion of some.

2. In advancing our comparative study, especially of Japan and other Asian rural societies, we find that Asian societies have the same high homogeneity as Japanese at the social and cultural level (see Ninomiya, 1973). Japanese rural sociologists should find an original theoretical framework and method within Japanese rural society, comparing it mainly with and attentatively to Asian rural Society and also to European and American society. If we can do so, we will be able to contribute

our theoretical framework and methods to other countries.

EARLY POSTWAR RURAL STUDIES

The first problem for Japanese rural sociology in postwar times was to re-examine, to make more precise, and to reorganize the theory and methods used in prewar times. The second problem, of course, was to find fresh areas of study.

A goal of this postwar thought was to view the meaning of the Japanese rural community as die Dorfgemeinde. The changes in the rural community must be grasped at an historical and concrete level since Suzuki's mura was considered an abstract and formal one. Hiromichi Yoden's concept of the hamlet community (considering particularly the rice fields might be compared with die dorfgemeinde, which studied the utilization of water. Yoden (1961) ascertained that the hamlet community (die Dorfgemeinde) was established because of cooperative management of irrigation in the area of complicated maintenance of rice fields, and that the social control for village life came from the same base. Kazuhiko Sumiya (1962) also analyzed die Dorfgemeinde on the basis of the compulsion to cultivate the rice field. The influence from M. Weber's theory about die Gemeinde is also present.

The study of kinship structure has been advancing in postwar times, too despite controversy on the subject of the principle of dōzoku. One viewpoint asserted that the connection of members of dōzoku depended upon external conditions such as economic, social, cultural factors and so on (Aruga, 1952). This theory explained that dōzoku was based on a group connected by genealogy and by cooperation in daily life. Another explanation was that the principle of dōzoku was one of inner genealogical relationships which made the honke (the main family) and the bunke (the branch family) recognize their apparent genealogical bonds (Kitano, 1951, pp. 175-195).

Kyōichi Kakizaki (1975, pp. 45-122.) analyzed the extended family in terms of the structure of the lives of the so-called "Large Family" at Shirakawa Village in Gifu Prefecture and produced some interesting results e.g.,: a) Members of the large family had not always lived together. b) Some of them stayed in another province for work and came home only during the farmer's busy season. c) The theories that the family consists of kin members and that the organization of kinship had matri-local and matri-lineage were questioned. This study intended to re-examine the theory of the extended family in Japan.

A fresh theory about the principle of dōzoku appeared, and proposed that the principle of dōzoku was not patri-lineal, but bilateral, constituted through the mother's side as well as the father's, with patrilineage nonetheless taking precedence over matrilineage. (Ninomiya, 1973).

The question of the relationship between the framework of the rural community and inner kinship organization has remained unsolved for a long time. My own field work at some villages in Noto Peninsula Ishikawa Prefecture is an effort in this direction. (See Ninomiya, 1975, pp. 123-158.)

The following new postwar studies should be mentioned. One of the topics was the study of society with a focus on class. The fundamental standpoint that such researchers took was that Japanese rural society should be considered within capitalistic framework. Thus, the analysis of class and stratum was the main theme in their studies. Even analysis of the rural community, if not connected to the analysis of the disintegration of such society, would lose significance, which is what they in fact ascertained (see Shimazaki, 1965).

Some studies were begun concerning rural social change. Initially, most of these were concerned with the transition of two types of villages, the evolution "from Dōzoku-like Village to Kōkumi-like Village (from Village of Kinship Group Affiliation to Village of Local Group Affiliation) (See Fukutake, 1949, pp. 34-48). Among these theories, those of Toshimi Takeuchi (1963) and his co-work-

ing researchers were unique. They thought about the driving force behind rural social change, and indicated that it was the birth of new social groups and their movement in rural society. Since many researchers had considered only the economic factor until then, this idea seemed a very sociological one. My own assertion was that rural social change should be understood in connection with rural society as a partial society in relation to the total one. Social change occurs fundamentally at the level of total society, and it has influence upon the rural part of society derivatively. Sometimes the change in a partial society produces a similar result in the total society (Ninomiya, 1967; see also Hasegawa, 1974).

The study of dominance in rural society began in postwar Japan. Tadashi Fukutake described some important types of dominance in Japanese rural society in various field work such as the dominance by the honke (main family), by the large landowner, by statute, and so on (Fukutake, 1959; see also Matsubara and Hasumi, 1960; Yasuhara, 1961). Kazuyuki Hashimoto suggested analyzing the village from the point of view of dominant order owing to integration of the arguments of both class (stratum) and ie combination which are apparently considered to be contrary to one another, as integration and struggle (Hashimoto, 1978; Ninomiya and Hashimoto, 1978).

Some volumes which represented an attempt to formulate the system of rural sociology which were published in postwar times included Shimazaki, 1965; Yoden, 1961; Ninomiya, 1967; and Hasumi, 1960).

RESEARCH DEVELOPMENTS

Eitarō Suzuki is the founder of the modern Japanese rural sociology, and his scientific system of Japanese rural society yielded a rich harvest to the academic world. Since his work, Japanese rural sociology has continued to develop. The scientific system of Suzuki, however, contained an important problem, its lack of

practicality.

Might Japanese rural sociology be a science of no practical use for the development of the Japanese rural society? The problem of relationship between pure and applied science must be considered. The solution to this problem is an important question for Japanese rural sociology.

When Tadashi Fukutake published his volume Nihon Nōson no Shakaiteki Seikaku (Social Character of Japanese Rural Society), (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1949)--the first volume about rural sociology in postwar times in Japan, he emphasized that the aim of Japanese rural society was to take the paths of democratization and modernization.

It is interesting that the founder of Japanese rural sociology accepted the influence from American sociology which matured in the first half of the Twentieth century, and on the other hand, the scholar who promoted development took a standpoint similar to that of American rural sociology when it was founded in the latter half of the Nineteenth century, the aim and foundation of which was common sense for the solution of rural social problems. Suzuki's theory was born in the period when the Japanese rural society was static and immovable, while on the other hand, Fukutake's came at a most exciting period, directly after the end of the war.

In postwar times in Japan, a great deal of research has been done in every stage of rural social change to deal with social problems. When the phenomena of overpopulation in rural society occurred in the period directly after the end of the war (about 1945-1955), Ryutarō Nakazima studied the rural population arrangement (Nakajima, 1957).

Many social problems occurred before and after enforcement of the Agricultural Land Reform Law. Gorō Morizumi (1955) studied exchange and annexation of agricultural land; Tadashi Fukutake and others studied social tensions which occurred relating to land reform; (1955) Kazuo Gotō and Tautomu Kamiya (1955)

treated social movement by farmers.

Various problems occurred because of the modernization of agriculture. Tetsuji Fuse and others clarified them (Fuse, et al., 1975). Minoru Shimazaki (1965) and Shigeru Yasuhara (no date) investigated agricultural laborers and analyzed labor power. Owing to living through the rapid rural social changes, agricultural co-operative groups and the collective management of rice fields, appeared in various regions. Tadashi Fukutake (1961), Kō Hosoya (1975) and others were representative researchers of these problems. From about 1965 the population in the rural society began to decrease rapidly. Yūichi Minakawa (1965) made the dynamics of such populations obvious. The rural community was gradually disorganized under the influence of industrialization and modernization. Akira Kawamo (1972) proposed a new idea relating to the boundary of the rural community. For the same problem, I proposed (1967) a plan connecting rural society and urban society as a unique community. This idea revives Galpin's theory of the tie between urban and rural society which Suzuki had dropped. Yoshio Saitō and others (1972) studied disorganization and reorganization of the rural community, which were produced as the consequence of disintegration of farmer's stratum. (See also Fukutake, 1977).

Few of these studies were of any use in solving problems directly. However, some of them enabled one to grasp the concept behind the phenomena of the social problems. One of the tasks given to sociology was to talk about the human being and society by using concrete facts in the same way that philosophy had spoken using abstract concepts. Sociology and philosophy may be considered as saying the same things about human beings, social values and society, but using different words. The relationship between theory and practice; the relationship between sociologists as scientists and the administrators, policy-makers, and actualists; the selection of a theme on which to center--these problems remain.

The opposition between Marxist sociology and modern sociology is related to this latter problem. Marxist sociology asserts uniqueness of theory and practice. In contrast, modern sociology first divides these two, and then thinks about the connection between them. Which is more scientific? Generally, this disagreement between Marxist sociology and modern sociology has been one of the important problems in rural sociological society in postwar times in Japan.

Marxist sociologists perform the job of analyzing the Japanese capitalistic system and of finding contradictions in the system directly, while indirectly they aim to establish the socialist system. From this point of view they analyze Japanese rural society. Some of the important themes which they take up are disintegration of class or stratum, the farmers' movement as a class struggle, the historical development in Japanese rural society, etc.

Disagreement about the quality, in spite of an ample quantity of Marxist sociologists, has lasted long and has been intense in Japanese rural sociology. This area of disagreement is one of the important problems faced by Japanese rural sociology.

Some current problems and goals for Japanese rural sociology follow:

1) to find an original theoretical framework and method for the Japanese rural society (see Ninomiya, 1976).

2) to advance the comparative study of Japanese and foreign rural society.

3) make comparisons with other Asian countries, e.g., Ninomiya, 1973; Fukutake and Morioka, eds., 1974). Analyzing research and theory about and from countries in the Third World (e.g., Ogura, 1977).

APPENDIX: RURAL SOCIOLOGY MEMBERSHIP AND ASSOCIATIONS

In prewar Japan, sociologists were characterized either as theoretical or rural sociologists, however, the number of rural sociologists were few. Postwar number of sociologists increased and has been increasing each year. The

increase and decrease of the rural sociologists over the years 1954-1973 is shown in the table below:

Rural Sociologists as a Percentage of a Sample of Members of the Japanese Sociological Society[a]

	1954	1966	1973[b]
Percent	16.1	15.5	25.2
Sample	366	496	890
Total JSS Membership	728	1100	1300

[a] Results of questionnaire completed by members of the Japanese Sociological Society.

[b] Includes specialists in the rural, mountain and fishing villages, and also of the regional community, about one third.

Source: Tadashi Fukutake (ed.), Sengo Nihon no Nōson Chōsa (Rural Social Research in Postwar Japan).

The number of rural sociologists has increased remarkably during these 20 years, assuming the prominent position in the Japanese sociological society.

Another association relating to rural sociological study, Sonraku Shakai Kenkyū Kai (Village Study Society), was established in 1952. It started with 101 members, increasing to 329 members in 1976. This society includes not only sociologists but also agricultural economists, economic historians, historians, economists, sociologists of law and so on. Initially, its bulletins dealt with a wide range of topics, but from 1965 onward, the association has published a periodical titled Sonraku Shakai Kenkyū (Study of Village Society).

It must be mentioned that both Chiiki Shakai Kenkyū Kai (Regional Socio-

logical Association), in 1975, and Mura Kenkyū Kai (Village Study Association) in the same year were established successively. The former under the belief that as urbanization and industrialization developed and rural and urban connections became remarkably strong, both societies should be studied in one regional community. So the members of this association were both rural and urban sociologists, 119 members at first, holding meetings several times a year.

The aim of the latter organization was to research the mura (village) which maintains its life even now. It started with about 30 members all rural sociologists, meeting several times a year.

REFERENCES

Aruga, Kizaemon. 1943. Japanese Family System and the Tenant System. Tokyo: Kawa-de-shobo.

_____1952. The Japanese Family, Ie (In the Japanese Race). Tokyo: Iwanami-shoten.

Fukutake, Tadashi. 1949. Social Nature of Agricultural Villages in Japan. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

_____1955. Peace in Hamlet and Tension Among Classes. In Village Study Society (ed.), Agricultural Land Reform and Farmers' Movement. Tokyo: Jicho-Sha.

_____1959. Social Structure of the Japanese Village. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

_____, (ed.). 1961. Agricultural Cooperation and Village Structure. Tokyo: Yuhikaku.

_____, (ed.). 1977. Rural Social Research in Postwar Japan. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

_____, and Kiyomi Morioka (eds.). 1974. Sociology and Social Development in Asia: Proceedings of the Symposium. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Fuse, Tetsuji et al. 1975. Logic of Structural Change of 'Ie' and 'Village Society' Under Influence of 'High Growth' of Capitalism. Pp. 159-226 in Study of Village Society, No. 11.

Gotō, Kazuo, and Tsutomu Kamiya. 1955. Establishment of the Salary Man Union and Its Conditions. In Village Study Society (ed.), Agricultural Land Reform and Farmers' Movement. Tokyo: Jichō-Sha.

Hasegawa, Akihiko. 1974. Structure and Change of Rural Society. Kyoto: Mineruba-shobo.

Hashimoto, Kazuyuki. 1978. Modern Rural Society and Dominance: Estrangement Between Real State and Agricultural Administration. In Takashi Usui and Ichino Sugimoto (ed.), Modern Society and Sociological Analysis. Kyoto: Academic Press.

Hasumi, Otohiko. 1960. Social Theory of Modern Rural Society. Tokyo: Jichō-sha.

Kanno, Tadashi, Otoyori Taware, and Kō Hosoya. 1975. Development of Rice Crop Agriculture and Village Structure. Tokyo: Ochanomizu-Shobō.

Kazizaki, Kyōichi. 1975. The Life Structure of the 'Large Family' at Shira Kawa Village at the Period of Effect of Capitalism. Pp. 45-112 in Study of Village Society, No. 11.

Kawamoto, Akira. 1972. Territory of the Village. In Study of Village Society, No. 8:151-172.

Kitano, Seiichi. 1951. The Japanese Extended Family System and the Feudal Remnants, in Feudal Remnants. Tokyo: Yuhikaku.

_____1976. Basic Theory of the Japanese Family and the Japanese Extended Family System. Tokyo: Miral-Sha.

Matsubara, Jiro, and Otohiko Hasumi. 1960. Administration and Village in Postwar Times in Village Study Society (ed.), Government System and the Village. Tokyo: Jicho-sha.

Minakawa, Yuichi. 1965. Analysis of the Trend to Part-time Agriculture by Farm Householders and the Heirs. Japanese Sociological Review 15, No. 3:2-25.

Morizumi, Goro. 1955. Developing Structure of Rural Society. Tokyo: Nihonhyoron-sha.

Nakajina, Ryutaro. 1957. Control for Arrangement of Rural Population. In Study of Village Society (ed.), Real State of Overpopulation in Rural Society. Tokyo: Jicho-sha.

Ninomyia, Tetsuo. 1967. Sociology of Japanese Rural Society. Tokyo: Seishin-shobo.

_____1968. The Result and the Problem in Rural Sociology. In Hiromich: Yoden and Jiro Matsubara (eds.), Rural Sociology. Tokyo: Kawashima-shoten.

_____1974. The Role of Sociologists in Social Development in Postwar Japan: From the Standpoint of Rural Sociological REsearch. Pp. 287-296 in Tadashi Fukutake and Kiyomi Morioka (eds.), Sociology and Social Development in Asia: Proceedings of the Symposium. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

_____1976. The Family, Kinship, and the Rural Community in Japan: Principle of Oya-Ko (Parents and Children) Relationship and Rural Social Structure. Paper presented at the Fourth World Congress of Rural Sociology Torun, Poland.

_____1973. The Structure and Principle of the Family and Kinship System in Asian Rural Societies. Japanese Sociological Review 24, 2:50-62.

_____1975. Social Structure of the Japanese Family, Ie, and the Village in Noto Peninsula. Pp. 123-158 in Study of Village Society No. 11.

_____, and Kazuyuki Hashimoto. 1978. Changing Types of Dominance in the Rural Community under the Influence of Industrialization in Japan. Paper presented at the Ninth World Congress of Sociology, Uppsala, Sweden.

Ogura, Mitsuo. 1977. The Third World and Sociology of Today. Japanese Sociological Review 28, 1:34-48.

Oikawa, Hiroshi. 1967. The Japanese Extended Family System and Village Life. Tokyo: Mirai-sha.

Saitō, Yoshio. 1972. Community Reorganization and Attitude of the Residents. The Study of Sociology Nos. 31 and 32.

Shimazaki, Minoru. 1965. Structure and Logic in Japanese Rural Society. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Sumiya, Kazuhiko. 1962. The Logic of the Historical Structure of the Village Community. Tokyo: Yuhikaku.

Suzuki, Eitarō. 1940. Principles of Japanese Rural Sociology. Tokyo: Jichō-sha.

Takeuchi, Toshimi, (ed.). 1963. Rural Social Change in the Tohuku Region. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Yasuhara, Shigeru. 1961. Direction of Agricultural Administration and Village Society. Tokyo: Jichō-sha.

_____ 1965. Process of Urbanization and the Farmer. Rural Society, Pp. 145-195 in Study of Village Soc iety, No. 1.

Yoden, Hiromichi. 1961. The Logical Structure of the Agricultural Village Society. Tokyo: Kobundo.

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF INSTITUTIONS AND PERSONALITIES

Academic Societies

Nihon Shakai Gakkai (Japan Sociological Society)
Executive Office: University of Tokyo, Department of Sociology, Hongō 7-3-1, Bunkyō-ku, Tokyo.

Sonraku Shakai Kenkyū Kai (Village Study Society)
Executive Office (in 1978-79): University of Utsunomiya, Department of Education, Mine-machi 350, Utsunomiya City.

Chiiki Shakai Kenkyū Kai (Regional Sociological Association)
Executive Office (in 1978-79): Chūō University, Department of Literature, Kandasurugadai 3-9, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo.

Mura Kenkyū Kai (Village Study Association)
Executive Office (in 1978-79): Aichi University, Department of Literature, Machihata 1-1, Machihata-chō, Toyohaski City

Universities and Rural Sociologists

University of Hokkaidō
Department of Literature, Nishi 7 Chōme, Kita 10 Jyō, Kita-ku, Sapporo City.
Rural Sociologists: Hiroo Kaneda, Tetsuo Mitani.
Department of Education, ibid.
Rural Sociologist: Tetsuji Fuse.

University of Tōhoku
Department of Literature, Sendai, Sendai City.
Rural Sociologists: Yoshio Saitō, Tsutomu Satō.
Course of Liberal Arts, ibid.
Rural Sociologist: Kō Hosoya.

Tōhoku Fukushi University
Department of Social Welfare, Kunimi 1-8-1, Sendai City.
Rural Sociologist: Toshimi Takeuchi.

University of Utsunomiya

Department of Education, Mine-machi 350, Utsunomiya City.

Rural Sociologist: Kyōichi Kakizaki.

University of Chiba

Department of Humanities, Yayoi-chō 1-33, Chiba City.

Rural Sociologist: Takashi Nakano.

Department of Education, Ibid.

Rural Sociologist: Yūichi Minakawa.

Gakugei University of Tokyo

Department of Education, Tsuranui-kitamachi 4-1-1, Koganei City

Rural Sociologist: Otohiko Hasumi.

Nōkō University of Tokyo

Course of Liberal Arts, Saiwai-chō 3-5-8, Fuchū City.

Rural Sociologist: Akiyoshi Takahashi.

Tokyo Metropolitan University

Department of Humanities, Yakumo 1-1-1, Meguro-ku, Tokyo.

Rural Sociologist: Nozomu Kawamura.

Seikei University

Department of Law, Kichishōji-kitamachi 3-3-1, Musashino City.

Rural Sociologist: Shigeru Yasuhara.

Chūō University

Department of Literature, Kandasurugadai 3-9, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo.

Rural Sociologist: Minoru Shimazaki.

Meiji University

Department of Agriculture, Ikuta 5158, Tama-ku, Kawasaki City.

Rural Sociologist: Akihiko Hasegawa.

Meiji Gakuin University

Department of Sociology, Shirakanedai 1-2-37, Minato-ku, Tokyo.

Rural Sociologist: Akira Kawamoto.

University of Kanazawa

Department of Law and Literature, Marunouchi 1-1, Kanazawa City.

Rural Sociologist: Tetsuo Ninomiya.

University of Yamanashi

Department of Education, Takeda 4-4-37, Kōfu City.

Rural Sociologist: Harunori Hattori.

University of Nagoya

Course of Liberal Arts, Furō-chō, Chigusa-ku, Nagoya City.

Rural Sociologist: Minoru Nakata.

Aichi University

Department of Literature, Machihata 1-1, Machihata-chō, Toyohashi City.

Rural Sociologists: Junji Kawagoe, Yoshiro Makinō.

Dōshisha University

Department of Literature, Karasuma-higashiiru, Imadegawa-dōri, Kamigyō-ku, Kyōto City.

Rural Sociologist: Michiharu Matsumoto.

Women's University of Nara

Department of Literature, Kitasakanaya-nishimachi, Nara City.

Rural Sociologists: Kazuo Gotō, Toshiyuki Mitsuyoshi.

Kansei Gakuin University

Department of Sociology, Ichiban-chō 1-155, Agehara, Nishinomiya City.

Rural Sociologist: Hiromichi Yoden.

University of Kyūshū

Department of Literature, Hakozaki 6-19-1, Higashi-ku, Fukuoka City.

Rural Sociologist: Kanji Naitō.

RURAL SOCIOLOGY IN BRAZIL

Jose Arthur Rios

The influence of European social thinkers was dominant in shaping what Brazilian scholars began to define in the 1930s as "rural sociology"--a blending of social history, sociology and social anthropology.

Lide its mother science, sociology, rural sociology started as sociography, often a naive description of (rural) phenomena by historians and chroniclers, travellers, and economists. They followed the nineteenth century naturalists and explorers who offered a tremendous contribution to further scientific studies by providing a solid background to build upon--a basis for comparison. After this descriptive phase, and partly simultaneous to it, one can detect a pre-scientific period when knowledge of rural reality per se began to be the conscious goal of many scholars (although their theoretical or methodological implements were seldom appropriate to the purpose.) A clear pattern of rural issues began to delineate itself in the ninettety century, after Independence (1822), and to attract the attention of statesmen and political writers during the late Empire and the Republic--such issues as the substitution for slaves of free labor, the threat of slavery's abolition to the latifundia and their labor supply, the competition between food and export crops, the problems of land distribution and people's acculturation brought about by European immigration, and everything which is summed up by the word "colonization," which in Brazil means specifically the settlement of new land by small farmers.

These problems were usually treated by social thinkers and reformers who subordinated their studies of rural or agrarian problems to a more general concept of society. In the pre-Marxian era, they were mainly intellectual products of French liberalism or utopian socialism. From Independence onward, the American model began to impress some of these publicists and after the 1840s more than one of them tried to present the American pattern of public land distribution and the homestead as appropriate to the Brazilian situation. As a matter of fact, the first Brazilian Land Law (1850) was largely a copy of the American system. It was never an effective application; the dream of Brazil's settlement by small farmers and homesteads was never realized, the only exception being the immigration areas in Southern Brazil.

A new impetus to the development of a scientific rural sociology came out of the legal colleges where positivism and evolutionism had strongly established themselves almost as "official" doctrines. Positivism became the ideology of the urban middle class and was operational in raising concern for the so-called social question and directing it to social and political changes which led to the abolition of slavery (1888) and the proclamation of Republic (1889). Although Positivism soon adopted a conservatist trend, its followers raised in Brazil, for the first time, the question of the integration of proletarian masses into society. This issue lies behind much of the literature of the period on rural labor; it clearly inspired a classic of Brazilian letters in which an episode of rural fanaticism which almost blew up the country, overthrew the Republic, and stirred a civil war is described (de Cunha, 1944 translation).

Sociologists of the Spencerian mode began to describe types of rural laborers and the peculiarities of regional societies--a trend which has been followed up to the present by some sophisticated social anthropologists and human geographers.

After this speculative period, social historians started to rethink the development of Brazil and began to detect historical types which were present in the social reality both before and after World War I. It became apparent through their studies that traditional society could be quite easily equated to rural society. Freyre's important work, Casa Grande & Senzala (1933), as well as his entire contribution to the study of patriarchal society in Brazil, led to a series of studies which pointed more to stability than to change in rural Brazil. (See also Rios, 1971).

The birth of rural sociology might be pinpointed in the decade of the 1930s. This was a period of great social unrest which culminated in the dictatorship of Getulio Vargas (1937). Many trends coalesced to bring about rural sociology: the mounting criticism against latifundia, the clash of rightist and leftist ideologies, the pressures of rural internal migration on cities, and the conflicts between capital and labor. Freyre's work, for instance, has clear social undertones, diluted in his later work. Regional inequalities, mostly due to rural backwardness, also attracted the attention of social reformers. More and more, national problems of underdevelopment began to be identified with rural problems or "deficiencies" such as poor agriculture, dispersion of settlements, illiteracy and bad health.

Americans also started to discover rural Brazil; a new specimen, the Brazilianist, was born in that same period. The American empirical approach

however only started to be applied to rural problems as a consistent scientific tool after World War II and reigned during the 1940s and 1950s, through dominant personalities such as T. Lynn Smith (1946) and Donald Pierson. Pierson exerted great influence through his introductory book on sociology (which ran into many editions in Portuguese), his monograph on a Brazilian community, Cruz das Almas, and through the Escola Livre de Sociologia e Política at São Paulo where he became the focus of a group of young researchers. New center of training and research such as the Escola Livre de Sociologia e Política at São Paulo were founded. From then on, exchange of students and the translation of articles and books gave impetus to this trend.

Growing interest in rural problems arose in several disciplines, and rural sociology was in some ways the result of the joint efforts of geographers, historians, and anthropologists as well as sociologists. The "Americanization" of rural sociology also stirred the first rural community and area studies in the 1950s. The institutionalization of sociology in university chairs and research centers had only indirect repercussions on the rural branch of the discipline which became largely associated to agricultural schools. Government efforts, even those we might label paternalistic meant to help agriculture or to "protect" rural people, were important in fostering study and research.

The general move in the 1950s (either paternalistic or populist-oriented) to improve general conditions and promote better living in rural areas was also a strong current in the development of scientific studies. Agrarian reform was the important agent behind all the scholarly work of of that period on rural social structure and levels of living. It was in

the 1960s that a clear differentiation arose between rural and agrarian sociology; the latter became permeated by different ideologies.

In the 1970s, this tendency was accentuated; a definite cleavage developed between empirical interpretative studies and the ideological--each cultivated by different academic coteries. General political conditions and the rise of a technocratic elite favored the split between conformists and the extreme followers of a so-called "conflict" sociology.

In the same period the attention of Brazilian rural sociologists was mainly focused on the issues and conflicts of national development. Rural sociology became more and more an agrarian sociology. Sociologists became concerned with the relations between people and land, and, above all, under Marxist and post-Marxist influences with rural labor relations.

This major change in the orientation of rural social studies was primarily due to the birth and expansion in Southern Brazil of an urban-industrial society which became a pole of attraction to internal migration, not only changing its relationship with rural society but also altering the structure of that rural society.

A new phase began. A descriptive approach to community studies and the analysis of rural behavior as part of traditional societies, with an anthropological perspective, did not disappear entirely, but rather assumed the function of operational tools, instrumental to agencies which aimed to develop rural areas or to intervene, in one way or another, in the rural milieu.

Thus operational research became a characteristic of this new phase primarily in the realm of regional development agencies such as SUDENE (Regional Development Superintendency for the Northeast), SUDAM (for the

Amazon basin) and SUDESUL (for the Southern area). Unfortunately, many studies done under the umbrella of such agencies still lie dormant in their archives and wait for the researcher who might sum up their conclusions or evaluate their methods and results.

Such pragmatic research has been responsible for feeding, through contracts and agreements of every sort, many private and public institutions, both private offices and university departments. Their multiplication in this period is another point to be considered. In São Paulo, for instance, it is important to stress the role of the Centro de Estudos Rurais e Urbanos, established in 1964 and annexed to the Social Sciences Department at the São Paulo State University. It has been handling research financed by administrative agencies for purposes of planning. Among the many studies generated at this Center, we might call attention to one which is not particularly representative of their work, Queiroz' study of the Paulista rural neighborhoods (Queiroz, 1973).

Beside the regional superintendencies mentioned, other public agencies were led through compulsion or changes of policy to shift their attention to problems of rural development. Such is the case of the Ministry of Interior (MINTER) which turned to the study of internal migration. Changes in composition and trends of internal migration started to bring about new problems for cities relating to their industrial growth. The attention of public agencies was called for. In 1974, the National Census Bureau (IBGE) sponsored a seminar which generated important studies giving emphasis to the demographic aspects of internal migration (Fundacao IBGE, 1976). Besides the Agricultural Census in 1974, the same agency has published a General Survey of Brazilian regions which contains valuable data on rural

structure and agricultural work. Such studies gave continuity to the work of Camargo and others of earlier decades about the same subject (Camargo, 1963). Concern with these population movements is indicative per se of the problematic nature of rural society as perceived by the urban and industrial leadership and which carries no similiarity with the exotic approach of an earlier period.

The Census Bureau, again, under the able chairmanship of economist Isaac Kerstenetzky, started one of the most important national research efforts ever carried out in Brazil, the study of food patterns for both urban and rural areas (Fundacao IBGE, 1977). The results which have begun to appear in Census publications are supplying scholars with invaluable data on rural poverty. Not only the study in itself but also its by-products are leading to the elaboration and testing of important social indicators.

As might be expected, the academic centers for rural research do not keep strictly within the boundaries of their disciplines. It is usual to find studies on rural sociology in departments which center on a different academic interest. This is, for instance, the case with the Center for Economic Studies and Research (IEPE) at the State of Rio Grande do Sul Federal University. The Center has been producing Ph.D. theses and monographs which are not always limited to its own academic purposes. (For examples, see Reis, 1971; Brumer, 1971; Gaboardi, 1971; Stulp, 1971; Scherer, 1972; Chaloult, 1972; Hansen, 1973.)

In the present decade, many earlier trends still exist although the academic tone has changed into a more pragmatic one. The wide field of community studies now encompasses national literacy movements as MOBRAL (UNESCO, 1974), health education (Bastos, 1966), workers' education,

housing, and planning projects. SUDAM, for instance, monitors a network of community development projects in the Amazon basin and evaluates these projects through research involving 40,000 questionnaires circulated to a varied sample in the area States and territories. (For a balance of trends and aspects of community development in Brazil, see Rios, 1978a.)

The diffusion of techniques and innovations in rural areas has also been the goal of many studies shared by North American and Brazilian sociologists. Most of these studies, started in the 1960s, have now begun to be published. (See Fliegel, 1966; Fliegel and Oliveria, 1963.) The same is true for studies of foreign immigration and of the resulting process of "colonization." Among these, it is worth stressing recent contributions to a better knowledge of rural Italians and Germans in Southern Brazil. (See Pereira, 1974; Azevedo, 1975; Frosi et al., 1975; Cenni, 1975; Seyferth, 1974.)

The opening up of the Amazon basin to new enterprises, the building of the Transamazonic highway and the polemics it stirred between state entrepreneurs and ecologists could not have failed to express themselves in recent literature. (See Benchimol, 1977). Meanwhile, it is interesting to notice that theoretical or methodological problems do not seem to have attracted the attention of Brazilian rural sociologists. This has been noticed by Professor Queiroz: "Those who study the Brazilian rural milieu (be what may their political or ideological orientation, and apart from it) are too conscious of the wide differences between rural and urban life, too anxious to master its evolution and orient it according to the various ideologies they profess to let themselves be carried away by methodological or theoretical concerns. The present Brazilian rural

sociology offers itself as a science which sets as its goals a confrontation with social reality." (Queiroz, 1974, p. 640.)

However, actual production in the field of rural sociology does not seem to equal Professor Queiroz' optimism when measured against the many problems resulting from rural society's expansion. There seems to be no proper proportion between the intellectual production of our science and the scale and immediacy of our problems. So far our scholars have been unable to deal with the growth of the urban market and the acceleration of industry which have both aggravated the rural people's marginalization and dependency; the proletarization of rural population; the amount of the public works aimed at changing the country's infra-structure,--dams, highways, reservoirs, all exert a great and often destructive impact on rural communities; the expansion of exports of foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials which has stressed the external dependencies and relationship between a traditional agriculture, closed in upon itself and limited to internal consumption, but open up the hazards of international markets; the limitations imposed on agrarian reform programs (such as PROTERRA) and the all too clear drawback of rural syndicalism, as contrasted with the expansion of paternalistic social security programs (such as FUNRURAL and others). (For a list of such programs, see Rios, 1978).

Some academic centers or institutes are examining some of the problems listed above, but no agency is trying to deal with them systematically so as to give Brazilian rural development a scientific and overall follow-up comparable to what has been done in the economy through Government agencies such as IPEA, or the many centers attached to

universities working under a system of contracts with the Government and committed to economic studies. EMBRAPA, the big national autarahy devoted to rural research, has concentrated its endeavors on more specific technological and agronomic areas. Agricultural schools, with a few exceptions, have followed this same pattern. As an example, we might cite the research on the alternatives of development in low-income groups in Brazilian agriculture carried out by several national agencies, agricultural schools, EMBRAPA, and Purdue University.

This apparent lack of interest in the human problems created by rural development is a symptom of the general discredit of sociology in official circles. The collapse of the most important training centers for rural sociologists in the country is a consequence of such trends.

A systematic survey of the research done would reveal obvious vacuums; Professor Queiroz has indicated the most apparent: the changes in the structure of the family group in several rural strata in particular, the social role of women; the relationship between changes in rural and urban social stratification; the dynamics of life styles and changes in social strata.

To these we might add the need to explore the after effects of urban and industrial growth, joint or separately on rural populations, according to region and the dominant agrarian structure; the change in recent years, brought upon the social and spatial structure in rural communities by public works of infra-structure; and the new types of rural community which such endeavors are producing in the country.

With the exception of a few academic centers, it seems that rural sociology has been eclipsed in Brazil. (Active centers, besides those

already mentioned, include the Instituto Joaquim Nabuco de Ciências Sociais, in Recife, Pernambuco and the Rural Universities--Ficosa, in Minas Gerais, and Rio de Janeiro. The cooperation of some American universities such as Wisconsin and its Land Tenure Center had some bearing on the development of our science in the 1970s.) Resources and research interests are increasingly concentrated on the study of urban areas and problems. Economists, prominent in government circles, tend to ignore rural and agricultural studies, the importance of which they fail to perceive. There is, we might note, a significant amount of literature centered on rural conflict,--ideological cliches which interpret rural Brazilian reality under the perspective of nineteenth century social conflicts. It is our contention that such tendencies are detrimental to the growth of a wider scientific knowledge on rural problems in Brazil which still calls for the ingenuity of theorists and researchers. As the government is still the primum movens in the country's cultural life, the announcement that agricultural and rural problems will be prominent among the concerns of the next Presidency opens new expectations for our discipline. Let us cross our fingers.

REFERENCES

Azevedo, Thales de. 1975. Italianos e gaúchos, A Nacão, Porto Alegre.

Bastos, N.C. Brito. 1966. Treinamento de Pessoal de Saúde Pública, Servico Especial de Sáude Pública, Rio de Janeiro.

Benchimol, Samuel. 1977. Amazonia: um pouco-antes e além-depois, Editora Umberto Calderano, Manaus,

Brumer, Anita. 1971. Sindicalismo rural e participacão dos agricultores em sidicato em Candelária, State of Rio Grande do Sul Federal University, Center for Economic Studies and Research.

Camargo, José Francisco de. 1968. A cidade e o camp: o êxodo rural no Brasil. Editora Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.

Cenni, Franco. 1975. Italianos no Brasil, Livraria Martins, São Paulo, (2nd edition).

Chaloult, Norma Beatriz. 1972. Processo Migratório Rural-Rural, State of Rio Grande do Sul Federal University, Center for Economic Studies and Research.

Cunha, Euclides da. 1944. Os Sertões (Revolt in the Back Country). English translation by Samuel Putnam: Chicago.

Fliegel, F.C. 1966. "Literacy and exposure to instrumental information among farmers in Southern Brazil" in Rural Sociology, Vol. 31, No. 1.

_____, and F.C. Oliveira. 1963. Receptividade a idéias novas e êxodo rural nama área colonial, Faculdade Ciências Econômicas.UFRS, Porto Alegre.

Frosi, Vitalina Maria et al. 1975. Imigracão Italiana no Nordeste do Rio Grande do Sul, Editora Movimento, Porto Alegre.

Fundacão IBGE. 1976. Encontro Brasileiro de Estudos Populacionais, Diretoria de Divulgacão, Rio de Janeiro.

_____. 1977. Consumo Alimentar. Antropometria. Dados preliminares, Rio de Janeiro.

Gaboardi, Luci de Lima. 1971. Aspiracões educacionais e ocupacionais da família rural em Garibaldi, State of Rio Grande do Sul Federal University, Center for Economic Studies and Research.

Hansen, David Oliver. 1973. Relacão entre posse e uso da terra e status social nas áreas rurais da região colonial do sul do Brasil, State of Rio Grande do Sul Federal University, Center for Economic Studies and Research.

Pereira, João Baptista Borges. 1974. Italianos no Mundo Rural Paulista, Pioneira, São Paulo.

Queiroz, Maria Isaura Pereira de. 1973. Bairros Paulistas, Livraria Duas Cidades, São Paulo.

_____. 1974. Novas Orientacões da Sociologia Rural no Brasil. Separata da Revista Ciência e Cultura, Vol. 26(7), São Paulo.

Reis, Ana Maria Bianchi dos. 1971. Integracão do operário de origem rural na sociedade urbano-industrial da Grande Porto Alegre, State of Rio Grande do Sul Federal University, Center for Economic Studies and Research.

Rios, José Authur. 1971. A Sociologia Rural no Brasil: sua evolucão, principais problemas e situacão atual, SPLAN, Rio de Janeiro, (mimeographed paper).

_____. 1978a. Popular Participation and Community Development (mimeographed paper), UN, Social Development Division.

_____. 1978b. Popular Participation and Community Development, (mimeographed paper). UN, Social Development Division.

Scherer, Ilse. 1972. Associativismo e Sindicalismo rural no Rio Grande do Sul, State of Rio Grande do Sul Federal University, Center for Economic Studies and Research.

Seyferth, Giralda. 1974. A colonizacão alemã no vale do Itajaí Mirim, Editora Movimento, Porto Alegre.

Smith, T. Lynn. 1946. Brazil, People and Institutions, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University (1st edition). (Translated into Portuguese by José Arthur Rios in 1967.)

Stulp, Valter José. 1971. Planejamento de uma empresa rural típica em Estrela, State of Rio Grande do Sul Federal University, Center for Economic Studies and Research.

UNESCO. 1974. L'experience brésilienne d'alphabetisation des adultes, le MOBRAL, Paris.

The History and Development of Rural and Peasant Studies in Iran

Cyrus Salmanzadeh

THE RURAL AND PEASANT SITUATION

More than half of Iran's population (currently estimated at 35 million) may be regarded as rural, [1] mainly living in some 55,000 scattered villages. Until the 1960s, most of these villages were closed to outside influences and had a rigid socio-political structure under the control of landlords and their agents. While some of these landlords owned 100 villages or more, most peasants were landless sharecroppers. Under this traditional system, the usually illiterate peasants remained 'silent,' "accustomed to having their landlords think and speak for them and tell them how to vote" (Schmidt, 1961).

The agrarian and rural structures have radically changed since the initiation of the Land Reform Programs in the 1960s. Old landlord-peasant relationships have been severed even though the introduction of many new village services by the Government has not replaced many of the vital roles performed by landlords and their agents.[2] Village life is changing rapidly under the impact of government politices and as a result of innumerable personal decisions to migrate, to take non-agricultural employment, and to educate their children. These current rural changes are crucial in the social and economic development of the nation.

The features of the traditional village situation and the impact of the recent agrarian programs on the lives of peasants have been the subject of a number of socioeconomic studies by scholars and students at various institutions both in Iran and abroad.

OBJECTIVE AND METHOD

The purpose of this paper is to examine the history and development of rural studies in Iran. To this end, it will outline the scope of early village studies and will describe the current status of rural social studies at various universities and centers throughout the country.

Information on the history of village studies is derived from available written sources while information on rural studies currently underway comes mainly from author's personal knowledge, interviews with colleagues involved in rural studies, and a questionnaire which was sent to approximately 30 academic departments and centers.

EARLIER RURAL STUDIES

Rural (village) study in Iran has a long history and goes back for more than 1,000 years. These earlier studies were mainly for the purpose of taxation and were, therefore, conducted by government agents and, in general, covered geographical and economic aspects of village life. However, in the earlier Islamic era, there were numerous studies concerning land use, irrigation techniques and the agricultural situation (Khosrovi, 1972, p. 1). About 100 years ago (during the Qajar dynasty), a few villages were studied by Estemad Al-Saltaneh, a native historian. These studies were presented in a three-volume work, Matlael Al-Shamce. He also wrote monographs on a number of villages in the northern part of Iran (Khosrovi, 1972, p. 1). A more significant work later than that of Etemad Al-Saltaneh, by Taqi Bahrami, a native of Iran, was published in 1937 (Bahrami, 1937).

Several studies were conducted between the first and the Second World Wars and particularly between 1942 to 1953 by native and also by foreign

researchers, particularly British, French, Americans and Russians. With the exception of the work of Jalal Ale-Ahmad, none of the native studies attempted to look into the village social situation--they were mainly concerned with political issues (Khosrovi, 1972, p. 1). Ale-Ahmad, a well-known Persian writer, studied social aspects of Owrazan--a village near Tehran, in 1947, and he recorded the villagers' beliefs, customs and traditions in a work published in a 1954 monograph (Ale-Ahmad, 1973, 4th edition).

Village life and traditional agrarian system of Iran have been analyzed more recently by a number of foreign scholars. Among these, the work of Ann Lambton (Professor of Persian at the University of London) concerning the historical background of the landlord and peasant share-cropping system in Iran has been widely recognized (Lambton, 1953). This work was first published in English in 1953 and was later translated into Persian and published in 1966.

In this connection the work of Near East Foundation (NEF) and Ford Foundation in 1950s in rural Iran also should be mentioned. NEF, an American private philanthropic organization, from 1946 through 1950s (in accord with a number of agreements with the government of Iran) was engaged in rural education and community development work in some 300 in Namazon area, near Tehran. The program was carried to the villages through multi-purpose extension workers and through village teachers. Part of this pilot project involved village socio-economice survey work as a basis for rural development activities. The Ford Foundation work in 1954 was in co-operation with the Iranian Ministry of Agriculture. It included an investigation in 30 selected villages to determine the relationship between rural population and cultivated land area.

RURAL SOCIAL STUDIES AT UNIVERSITIES AND RESEARCH CENTERS

The subject of sociology is relatively new in Iran. It was introduced for the first time in the early 1940s by Gholam Hossein Sediqi (a French-educated Persian) whose work was followed closely by Yahya Mahdavi who wrote the first sociology book in Persian (Arianpour, 1963).

Tehran University

Tehran University which is the oldest and the largest university in Iran (established in 1937 and currently having about 20,000 studies with over 2,000 staff) was the first institution in Iran to teach and to conduct research in urban and rural sociology. Since the early 1960s, sociology and rural social studies have become a part of academic programs of most other Iranian universities as well.

Prior to the 1950s there was no academic institution in Iran directly concerned with teaching or research in sociology. There were only a few students of the Tehran University Faculty of Law and Faculty of Letters who were involved in studying certain aspects of rural and urban social life.

A major development in teaching and research in the field of sociology occurred, then, in 1958-59 when an institute for social studies and research was established at Tehran University. This new institute was headed by Ehsan Naraqi, a French-educated Iranian social scientist (currently head of the Center for Studies and Research in Sciences and Education). The institute originally consisted of departments of political sociology, rural studies and tribal (nomad) studies and offered a post-licentiate (i.e., Master's) program in social studies. Besides a few full-time staff members, the institute was also assisted by a number of lecturers from Tehran University Faculty of Letters. Among them was Gholam Hossein Sediqi who

taught a course in Elmole Al-Ajtema (sociology) at the post-graduate level and Shapur Rasekh who taught a sociology course at this institute at about the same time. The teaching and research activities of the institute have gradually expanded and in the early 1970s, it was renamed the Faculty of Social Sciences and Cooperation. In 1977, this new faculty consisted of the following departments: political sociology, rural studies, tribal studies, comparative sociology, psychology, anthropology, demography, urban studies, and cooperation; it offers at the undergraduate level four different options: sociology, anthropology, demography and co-operative science. At the graduate level, one post-licentiate degree course in social studies is offered and in this course, the students are allowed to do thier research in any one of the departments mentioned above.

The activities of the Department of Rural Studies have involved both teaching and research. A British lecturer taught the first rural sociology course at this institute in 1958-59. At the early stages the research activities were closely linked with the work of the department of tribal studies. Independent rural research work started in 1963-64 when the department of rural studies initiated a new course to train rural social researchers to conduct field work. Four years later a chair in rural sociology was officially established at the institute and Khosrow was appointed as a full-time lecturer for this new position. The department has been active in conducting rural social research and by 1977, about 60 research publications have been produced by the members of the department. Among the publications, the rural sociology text by Khosrovi (1972); written in Persian, is worth mentioning. Most of these are in the form of monographs, based on micro-level (village studies, for example, the work of Jafi-Nezhad in the village of Talb-abad, one of the first comprehensive

village studies in Persian (1966).

Parallel with the work of the Department of Rural Studies, the Faculty of Agriculture of Tehran University in Karaj was to some extent involved in rural social studies. Prior to 1946, courses in agricultural law, agricultural geography and village (farm) management were included in the three year curriculum of the undergraduate students. These courses were taught by part-time instructors, mostly from the Ministry of Agriculture.

In 1946, a chair in agricultural economics was established at the Faculty of Agriculture and Homan, a Persian lawyer, was appointed to that chair. In the early 1960s, Homan created a department mainly concerned with teaching courses in agricultural economics. However, in 1968-69 a course in rural sociology was offered in this department and taught by Kodarzi, an American-educated rural sociologist who, unfortunately, died before completing the course. Since this time, rural sociology has become a part of the curriculum of agricultural economics and from the early 1970s, courses in extension and agricultural education have been added to the undergraduate program.

In the mid-sixties, the forestry section was detached from the Faculty of Agriculture to form a new Faculty of Natural Resources. Although the curriculum of this faculty has consisted mainly of technical subjects related to plant sciences and forestry, "woodlot management" has also been included in the program. In this connection, a socioeconomic study has recently been carried out in a number of villages in woodland area near the Caspian Sea, aimed at encouraging the peasants to substitute kerosene for wood as fuel for cooking to protect the forest from excessive damage.

University of Azarabadegan

Unfortunately, information concerning the status of rural studies at other universities is not well documented. However, it appears that among the provincial universities, the University of Azarabadegan (formerly known as the University of Tabriz) has the longest history of rural studies. In the early 1960s, an institute for social research was established within the Faculty of Letters, the major activity being rural studies. Among the pioneering staff of this institute, the work of Ali Akbar Torabi is notable. Torabi wrote a small rural sociology book in 1963, probably the first rural sociology book published in Persian (Torabi, 1963). At present, there are a number of sociologists at the University of Azarabadegan with keen interest in rural studies. However, the activities of the Faculty of Agriculture in the field of rural socioeconomic studies have been rather limited. According to the information received from authorities, there is currently no department for agricultural economics or rural extension; courses in these fields are taught by the staff of agronomy department. A rural sociology course has, since 1965, been taught be lecturers from the Faculty of Letters to the students of agriculture.

University of Shiraz

At the University of Shiraz (formerly known as Pahlavi University), the subject of rural sociology was introduced in 1965 when the Department of National Development was founded within the Faculty of Art and Science to train individuals capable of making a major contribution to the progress of urban, rural, and tribal communities. To broaden the scope of this program a field research center was established in the provincial town of Marvdasht, north of the city of Shiraz, to serve as a basis for the execution of field work in the rural and tribal areas (Department of National Development and

Sociology, 1977, p. 1). Recently, the two departments of national development and sociology were merged and a Department of National Development and Sociology was formed. This new department offers two B.S. degrees: one in sociology and the other in development and regional planning. In addition, it offers a two-year M.S. program in population and development.

Ismail Ajami, an American-educated Iranian rural sociologist, initiated rural social research at micro-level at the Department of National Development. His initial work in villages of Marvdasht has been published both in Persian and in English (Ajami, 1969). He is now one of the deputies to the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development and has been instrumental in introducing a program to support peasant group farming. This involves "reactivating" a traditional peasant work institute in agricultural production (commonly known as boneh) in rural Iran.

The work of the Faculty of Agriculture of the University of Shiraz has not directly been related to rural social studies. Until recently the Department of Agricultural Economics has mainly been concerned with teaching courses, but now some village-level economic studies have been undertaken by this department.

Jundi Shapur University

At the Jundi Shapur University in Ahvaz, activities in rural social studies have mainly been concentrated at the Faculty of Agriculture in Ramin (formerly known as Malla-Sani). From 1955 to 1961 courses in agricultural law, agricultural economics, and farm management were included in the three-year curriculum of agricultural students. In 1961, the curriculum was revised and a number of social science courses were added to the new four-year undergraduate program which included social psychology, rural sociology and agricultural education. The first two courses were taught (in 1962-63

and in 1963-64 respectively) by Donna Shalala, an American Peace Corps Volunteer, and the agricultural education course was offered in 1963-64 by George Luster, an American agricultural education specialist, who took the initiative in establishing a department of rural education (Salmanzadeh, 1968, p. 5). The rural education work was given a new dimension by Cyrus Salmanzadeh, who realizing the importance of extension education in agricultural and rural development, introduced in 1964-65 (for the first time in Iran), an extension course into the four-year curriculum of the agriculture students. Salmanzadeh has also conducted a series of socio-economic field investigations in villages near the towns of Ahvaz and Dezful and on the basis of these studies, a number of publications have been produced, both in Persian and in English.[3]

The work on agricultural economics, was, until 1970, carried out in an independent department, but since 1970, there has been only one department (currently known as the Department of Extension and Rural Development) dealing with both social and economic aspects of agriculture.

Other Universities

Among the older universities in Iran, University of Esfahan and University of Ferdousi in Mashad, have no department for rural studies or agricultural economics; however, in both of these universities some aspects of local tribal and village life have been studied in their departments of geography. Among the newer academic institutions, there seems to be a tendency to include rural social studies in the curriculm of students in agriculture and in education. The University of Rezaiyyeh, which was established in 1964 as an agricultural faculty, has included courses in extension and rural sociology in their four-year curriculum and since 1968-69 has even offered an extension option to the agricultural students.

The Abu-Raihan-e Bironi University (formerly named Revolution Corps), in Mamazan near Tehran, which used to provide opportunities for the former Corps members to further their education, has had, since the early 1970s, a Faculty of Rural Development. The students of this faculty are taught courses in economic and social aspects of rural life. The University of Boali in Hamaden has a special program for students in various fields to study village life; work at the village level constitutes a part of students' practical training. Furthermore, the Environment and Natural Sciences Center of this university also conducts rural studies.

The Azad University, which was founded in the early 1970s and is patterned after the Open University of Britain, has also been emphasizing rural studies in their program, and most students are required to take courses in rural sociology and anthropology. Eilam College of Animal Science, which is one of the faculties of the Rozi University in Kermanshah, and the three independent agricultural colleges in Zanjan, Hamadan and Sarie also offer courses in social and economic aspects of agriculture.

Institute for Iranian Rural and Peasant Studies

Besides the academic institutions mentioned above, there is a new institute in Tehran where the main interest is the study of rural and peasant communities in Iran. This institute was founded in July, 1976. Among its activities, the institute is planning to establish a rural and peasant documentation center and intends to publish the results of its activities in the form of reports and articles (Institute of Iranian Rural and Peasant Studies, 1977, p. 2).

The director of this center, Nadar Afshar Naderi, is a French-educated Iranian anthropologist and a lecturer at the Tehran University Faculty of Social Sciences and Cooperation.

Other Centers of Rural Studies

There are also a number of agencies studying the rural social situation on an ad hoc basis. Among them, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development carries out village socioeconomic studies as does the Ministry of Arts and Culture. The Plan and Budget Organization has an office for social planning--rural social studies consitute a part of the activities of this office. The Statistics Center of Iran, which organizationally is a part of the Plan and Budget Organization, carries out rural social studies which are mostly demographic in nature. The Legion for Humanity Services, a voluntary organization with its headquarters in Tehran, also studies village life. A number of regional development projects, e.g., Qazvin Development Project and Al-Ashtar Integrated Development Project, have conducted a series of village level social and economic studies as a part of their development work.

In addition to the above mentioned agencies which sponsor rural study projects, there are a number of students, both in Iran and elsewhere in the fields of social sciences, education, and development who conduct independent rural social and economic studies as part of their academic requirements.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Iran has traditionally been an agricultural country with more than half of its population dependent on the land for their livelihood. The traditional peasant sharecropping system has changed as a result of agrarian reform of 1960s and villages have become more open to social investigations. Universities, research centers and government agencies have, to various degrees, been involved in rural studies. Most universities in Iran have included rural sociology and extension education in their curricula, some

offering rural studies as a major degree course. However, from the research point of view, there are still too few micro-level comprehensive village studies to fully understand the state of peasant agriculture and the villagers' adjustment in various regions of the country since the agrarian reform of 1960s. Such studies are necessary in order to suggest compatible supporting services required for the village to function as a productive community. The need for trained sociologists with a sensitive appreciation and knowledge of rural life to undertake such studies is vital. In turn, the knowledge from such investigations would increasingly form a major basis for teaching future students, as well as providing the necessary sociological insight to the rural condition which is essential for the country's policy-makers.

NOTES

[1]Within the traditional Iranian cultural context, "rural," "peasant," and "agriculture" were often used synonymously because the rural inhabitants were predominantly peasant agriculturalists.

[2]For further information, see Cyrus Salmanzadeh, "The Impact of Agrarian Reform Measures on Village Social Structure in Rural Dezful, Iran, with Specific References to Required Development in Extension Work," Ph.D. thesis, University of Reading, England, 1976.

[3]For example, Cyrus Salmanzadeh, Social Survey of Naddafieh Village. Ahvaz, Iran: Jundi-Shapur University, 1969. Also "Changes in Traditional Peasant Agriculture of Northern Khuzestan," Journal of Scientific Agriculture. No. 4, November, 1977.

REFERENCES

Ajami, Ismail. 1969. Shishdangi. Shiraz, Iran: University of Shiraz.

Ajami, Ismail. 1969. "Social Classes, Family Demographic Characteristics and Moluity in Three Iranian Villages." Sociologia Ruralis Vol. 9, No. 1.

Ale-Ahmad, Jalal. 1973. Owrāzān (4th ed.). Tehran, Iran: Mazeyar Publications.

Arianpour, A. H. 1963. Zamineh Jamaeh-Shenasie [Introduction to Sociology]. Tehran, Iran: Dehkhoda.

Badeau, John S. and Georgiana G. Stevens (ed.). 1966. Bread from Stones Fifty Years of Technical Assistance. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bahrami, Taqi. 1937. Farhang-e Rustai [Rural Encyclopaedia]. Tehran, Iran: Sherkat Chap-e Khodkar.

Department of National Development and Sociology. 1977. Bulletin for B.S. in National Development and Regional Planning, 1977-78.

Institute of Iranian Rural and Peasant Studies. 1977. Report on the History, Objectives, and Activities of the Institute.

Khosrovi, Khosro. 1972. Jamaeh-Shenasie Rustai Iran [Rural Sociology of Iran]. Tehran, Iran: University of Tehran.

Lambton, Ann K. S. 1953. Landlord and Peasant in Persia. London: Oxford University Press.

Safi-nezhad, Javad. 1966. Talb-abad. Tehran, Iran: Tehran University Press.

Salmanzadeh, Cyrus. 1978. Report of the Department of Extension and Rural Development, Jundi-Shapur University.

Schmidt, Dona Adams. 1961. Peasants are Key to Future of Iran. The New York Times, August 6.

Tahqiqat-e Eqtesadi, Nos. 9 and 10, November, 1964.

Torabi, Ali Akbar. 1963. Jamaeh-Shenasie Rustaie [Rural Sociology]. Tabriz, Iran: Tabriz University.

The State of Agricultural Social Science and Related Fields in Selected Countires of the ECWA Region

Salah M. Yacoub

INTRODUCTION

The developing countires of the ECWA region[1] are presently emphasizing the development of their agricultural and rural sectors in their recent national development plans, but it must be admitted that such emphasis is not yet sufficient when we consider that the majority of the population in these countries is classified as rural. Moreover, these plans reflect the countries' recent interest in applying the integrated approach to rural development (IRD) in which both the development of human resources and that of agriculture are considered equally important. This approach aims at increasing production and creating employment opportunities in rural areas, building up the necessary institutions, reducing the inadequate income distribution, investment in human betterment, ensuring people's participation in action-oriented programs, and finally, involving the local machinery in the integration of rural development activities. Several rural development projects with modest budget allocations will be executed by some of those countries (Table 1) for which professional and technical staff having various specializations, including those specialized in the agricultural social sciences, will be needed. A recent survey (UN Economic Commission for Western Asia, 1978) revealed that one of the major difficulties and problems which has been faced, and is still faced by some ECWA countries in their IRD undertakings is the shortage of the qualified and well-trained national personnel that are needed to work in these projects. This study assumes that such shortage stems from the fact that agricultural training institutes and universities, if found in these countries, are not adequately equipped to offer instruction and specialized training in agriculture, particularly in agricultural

social science and related fields[2] strongly needed for the development of the human resource base of the rural sector. Education and training of those key personnel is necessary in order to bring about rural transformation.

This paper is an attempt to assess the present academic training in agricultural social science offered by 42 national universities and other specialized educational institutes in twelve ECWA countries (Table 2). In addition, the number of nationals studying abroad and majoring in these areas, as well as governments' expenditures on higher education, will be analyzed.

METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire containing seven major questions on the state of agricultural social science was prepared and mailed to key nationals and university professors or administrators who returned their answers for further analysis. Originally, the questions sought the following information:

1. Names of the universities or specialized educational institutes teaching agricultural social science;
2. The presence, at the university or the institute, of a separate department/s dealing with one or more of these subjects and the faculty or college to which each department belongs;
3. Number of students and faculty members in each field of specialization;
4. Types of degrees offered in these fields;
5. Plans to expand or strengthen any of these fields in the future;
6. Type of studies and research activities undertaken in each field; and
7. Present and potential contributions of these fields to rural development of the country.

Unfortunately, however, the information received from the key persons was incomplete. For this reason, secondary sources were sought, particularly when dealing with fields related to agricultural studies in areas such as anthropology,

economics, mass communication, public administration, social psychology, social work and sociology. In addition, due to the lack of information on the last three points of the questionnaire, these points were omitted from our analysis.

FINDINGS

Teaching of Agricultural Social Science and Related Fields and Degrees Offered:

The results of the investigation are summarized in Tables 2 through 10. Table 2 reveals that only 29 of the 42 higher educational institutions in the twelve countries offer instruction in one or more agricultural social science field; of these, 14 (or about 50 percent) give Bachelor of Science degrees or higher in one or more of these fields (Table 3). Most of the departments are located within the faculties of Agriculture which offer mainly B.S. degrees in general agriculture (except for most universities in Egypt which offer Ph.D degrees in this field).

When examining each specialization within only the agricultural social sciences, it was found that 13 higher educational institutions of the 29 emphasized rural sociology and rural development but only four of these offered University degrees, usually the B.S. in that field. Until 1975 the American University of Beirut was the only university which offered an M.S. degree in rural sociology but after that date the degree was given in rural extension and development.

Agricultural extension education and agricultural economics were emphasized by 14 and 19 educational institutions respectively, but only seven offered B.S. or M.S. degrees in extension education and nine offered such degrees in agricultural economics. However, there is a tendency for some to offer a combined major in two or more of the agricultural social science fields such as rural sociology, agricultural economics and extension education. Instruction in home economics, agricultural cooperatives and management and nutritional science were the least

emphasized by the higher educational institutions covered in this report.

Offerings in sociology and other social science fields were more common. Thirty-eight of the 42 higher educational institutions gave university degrees and/or instruction in one or more of these fields. Among these, only Khadouri Agricultural Institute in the West Bank taught social science subjects but offered no university degree in any of them (Table 4). Of the 38 institutions of higher education teaching social science subjects, 32 (or 8 percent) taught economic courses and 28 offered B.A. or higher degrees in economics. The next most popular socia science field was sociology which was followed by psychoogy in which courses and university degrees were given by 24 and 22 institutions respectively. Twenty-four offered instruction in sociology, seven gave Ph.D. degrees in this field, while four gave M.A. degrees, two gave a diploma of higher studies and eight gave B.A. degrees. (See Table 4 for those with offerings in political science, social science, social work, public administration, mass communication and anthropology.)

Number of Students and Faculty Members in Agricultural Social Sciences and Related Fields:

Data on number of students enrolled in agricultural social science were not available for several higher educational institutions; however, more data were available on student enrollment in faculties of agriculture and arts as a whole (See Tables 5 and 6). Only six of the original 29 higher educational institutions which gave instruction in one or more fields of agricultural social science had data on their student enrollment (Table 5). The University of Mustanseriyeh in Baghdad, Iraq and Ein-Shams University in Egypt had the highest student enrollment, followed by the University of Cairo and the University of Baghdad. The universities in Iraq tend to give more emphasis to agricultural cooperatives and management than other agricultural social science fields due to the importance which the Government is giving to the establishment of cooperatives and state

farms as a means to develop the country's agricultural sector. In fact, all agricultural social science students enrolled at the University of Mustanseriyeh (total 896) were studying agricultural cooperatives and management.

Table 5 shows that data on the number of full-time faculty members teaching agricultural social science courses was only available for 12 of the 29 institutions. These 12 had a total of 35 full-time faculty members teaching agricultural social sciences. Among them, the University of Mustanseriyeh and Ein-Shams University had the largest number of teachers followed by other Egyptian Universities of Alexandria, Assyout, Cairo and Alzakazik. However, teacher student ratios were relatively low in practically all of these universities.

Post-graduate work tends to be very limited in the higher educational institutions covered by this report. Data available showed that only the American University of Beirut and the University of Baghdad offered the Master of Science degree in such fields and in which only 29 students were registered.

Student enrollment in the social sciences and number of full-time faculty members teaching them are much higher than those in the agricultural social sciences. Of the original 38 institutions which offered instruction in one or more social science fields (see Table 4), 23 had information on the number of their student enrollment in the social sciences and/or on the number of their full-time faculty members teaching social science courses (Table 6). The student enrollment in the 23 institutions reached a little over 27,000 and the number of full-time teachers was 379. The leading universities, in number of students enrolled in the social sciences, were the University of Cairo, the University of Alexandria, and the University of Baghdad which were followed by the Lebanese University, Beirut Arab University and the University of Mustanseriyeh. The latter had the highest number of full-time social science teachers, followed by Ein-Shams and Cairo Universities; but when teacher-student ratios

were examined, it was found that these universities had a very low number of full-time teachers per 100 students probably reducing the quality of education offered in the social sciences.

Information on student enrollment in social science post-graduate work was scarce. Of the 15 institutions which offered post-graduate work in one or more social science fields (see Table 4) only five had data on their student enrollment at that level, 2126 students in all. The University of Cairo constitutes 88 percent of this total (Table 6).

Student enrollment in sociology proper and the number of full-time sociology teachers are presented in Table 7. It was shown in Table 4 that 24 higher educational institutions gave instructions and/or university degrees in sociology but information was only available on 14 of these. Student enrollment in sociology for the 14 universities reached 6833 and the number of full-time faculty members teaching sociology courses was 89 (Table 7). The University of Alexandria had the highest student enrollment in sociology and philosophy followed by Beirut Arab University and the University of Cairo. These universities, however, had the lowest teacher-student ratios ranging from 0.1 to 1.1 teachers per 100 students.

Number of Nationals Studying Abroad and Majoring in Agricultural Social Science and Related Fields

Only 9 countries had information on the number of their nationals studying abroad, either on their own or on government scholarships, their field of specialization, and types of degrees sought. It is evident from Tables 8 and 9 that social sciences tend to be more popular than agricultural and agricultural social science fields among nationals studying abroad. The total number of nationals studying abroad from the nine countries and majoring in the various agricultural fields reached 1722 compared to 6497 nationals from the same countries who were studying social sciences abroad. Of the former group of

majors, only 82 (5 per cent) were studying agricultural social sciences and the rest were majoring in general agriculture. The number of rural sociology majors were found to be negligable (Table 8). Of the latter group the nationals studying social sciences abroad, 5616 (86 percent) had a social science major while only a very small group (49 students or 0.07 percent) majored in sociology. Among the countries covered, Jordan has the highest number of nationals (a total of 5312) studying social science abroad (Table 9).

Degrees sought by a large portion of the students studying agricultural social sciences and related fields abroad were unspecified, but there is a tendency, judging from the available data, for the majority of those to be working toward university degrees higher than the B.A. or the B.S.

Governments' Expenditures on University and Higher Education

Current public expenditures on various levels of education, including the university level, in some countries of the ECWA region are presented in Table 10. Saudi Arabia, although it has only four universities, allocated about 40 percent of its total 1974 public expenditure on education to the university level. Other oil-producing countries such as Kuwait, Bahrain and Qatar had also allocated a relatively high proportion of their educational expenditure to university and higher level education while the number of the institutions serving this level in each country did not exceed one. Jordan and Egypt seemed to allocate more than two-thirds of their educational public expenditures to secondary level education, while the share for universities from such expenditures was relatively small.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is evident from the findings presented above that universities and institutions of higher learning in the ECWA region do not give due emphasis to agricultural social sciences in their academic training. Only 29 of the 42

institutions covered in this report offered instruction in one or more of these fields. Available data showed that not only universities in the ECWA region gave insufficient emphasis to agricultural social sciences in their academic training, but also students studying abroad had little desire to major in any of these fields.

The present state of agricultural social science in the ECWA region is not conducive to the implementation of the various integrated rural development projects which are being carried out in the region. Projects will continue to suffer from the shortage of qualified and well-trained high-level manpower for some time to come; and the greater emphasis given to training in sociology and other social sciences will fail to satisfy such shortage. This is basically due to the improper training students receive in applied social sciences and to the emphasis given to classical theory and conceptualization rather than to applied problem-solving techniques. Such applied orientation of course offerings is also lacking among the agricultural social sciences. In addition to the need for increasing course offerings and majors in the various agricultural social science fields to meet the demand of Integrated Rural Development projects, universities should also attempt to restructure such courses in the direction of giving more emphasis to case studies, problem-solving and field work. It is also advisable for the departments of sociology and other social sciences to cooperate closely with the departments of rural sociology and other agricultural social sciences within the same university when deciding on the contents of courses offered in order to give such courses the applied rural orientation which they need. Offerings of joint and/or interdepartmental seminars should also be encouraged to better equip students in dealing with rural problems.

The very low teacher-student ratios in the agricultural social sciences in the majority of the higher educational institutes covered also affects negatively the quality of university training offered in these fields. This very low ratio,

particularly in Egypt, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq, is affected by the outflow of highly qualified persons (braindrain) to developed countries as well as to countries within the region such as Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States. This movement inpairs considerably the development of agricultural social science in particular and of the needed scientific and technological education in general. Unless favorable working conditions and incentives are being provided to full-time faculty members in the agricultural social sciences, such braindrain phenomenon will continue to occur.

Table 1. Number of Present Agricultural Development Projects and Percent of Allocations for the Development of the Agricultural Sectors with Respect to Total Allocations for All Sectors during the Plan Periods[a]

Country	Plan Period	Total Allocations for all Sector (in Millions)	% Total Allocations Devoted to Agriculture	Projects
Iraq (I.D.)[b]	1975	1076 US$ 3636.9	19.3	197
Jordan (J.D.)	1976-80	765 US$ 2463.3	5.2	28
Lebanon (L.L.)	1972-77	1250 US$ 412.5	64.2	15
Oman (O.R.)	1976-80	934.8 US$ 2749.4	4.4	..
Democratic Yemen (Y.D.)	1974-78	75.4 US$ 221.8	36.8	46
Saudi Arabia (S.R.)	1975-80	318416[c] US$ 89156	12.2[d]	83
Syria (S.L.)	1976-80	54177 US$ 14083	23.8	73
Yemen (Y.R.)	1976-80	18429.1 US$ 4088.5	14.7	59

a - Recalculated by the Social Development and Human Settlement Division based on the following sources:
- For Iraq, the National Development Plan 1975;
- For Jordan, the Five-Year Development Plan 1976-1980;
- For Lebanon, the Six-Year Development Plan 1972-1977;
- For Oman, the Five-Year Development Plan 1976-1980;
- For Democratic Yemen, the Five-Year Plan for Economic and Social Development 1974/1975 - 1978/1979;
- For Saudi Arabia, the Second Development Plan 1975 - 1980;
- For Syria, the Forth Five-Year Plan for Economic and Social Development 1976 - 1980.

b - Figures are only for one year since the plan has not yet been published.
c - Excluding allocations for defense and general administration.
d - Agricultural allocations do not include provisions for regional development. However, it includes provisions for water and desalination of which 80% was allocated to irrigation.

Table 2. Distribution of Higher Educational Institutions Included in the Survey According to Countries and Number Giving Instruction in Agricultural Social Science Fields.

Country	No. of Educational Institutions	No. Offering Ag. Social Sciences
Egypt	10	9
Iraq	5	5
Jordan	2	2
Kuwait	1	0
Lebanon	7	2
Democratic Yemen	2	2
Qatar	1	1
Saudi Arabia	4	2
Syria	4	4
United Arab Emirates	1	1
West Bank	4	1
Yemen Arab Republic	1	0
Total	42	29

Table 3. Higher Educational Institutions in the ECWA Region, Presence of Various Departments Related to Agricultural Social Sciences in Their Respective Agricultural Colleges and Highest Degrees Offered[a]

Country and Educational Institutions	Rural Sociology	Rural Development and Planning	Agric. Extension Education	Agric. Economics	Home Economics	Agric. Co-operatives and Management	Nutritional Science	General Agriculture
EGYPT								
Al-Azhar University	..	..	M.S.	..	..	..	..	Ph.D.
University of Alexandria	..	..	..	B.S.[b]	..	..	B.S.	Ph.D.
University of Assyout	X	H.D.	..	B.S.[b]	..	H.D.	B.S.	Ph.D.
Ein-Shams University	..	..	..	B.S.[b]	D.[c]	..	B.S.	Ph.D.
University of Cairo	B.S.[d]	..	..	B.S.[d]	B.S.	..	..	Ph.D.
University of Hilwan	..	..	..	..	B.S.[e]	..	..	..
University of Mansourah	..	..	..	X	..	..	X	Ph.D.
University of Al-Zakazik	B.S.	B.S.	B.S.	B.S.	..	B.S.	B.S.	Ph.D.
University of Tanta	B.S.	..	B.S.	B.S.	..	..	B.S.	Ph.D.
IRAQ								
University of Baghdad	..	..	M.S.	..	B.A.[c]	M.S.	..	B.S.
University of Basra	..	..	X	X	..	..	..	B.S.
University of Mousel	..	..	M.S.[f]	M.S.[f]	..	..	..	B.S.
University of Sullemanieh	..	..	B.S.[g]	..	..	B.S.[g]	..	B.S.
University of Mustanseriyeh	..	..	..	..	..	B.S.[h]	..	..
JORDAN								
University of Jordan	..	..	..	X	..	..	..	B.S.
Yarmouk University	..	..	..	B.A.[i]	..	..	..	..
LEBANON								
American University of Beirut	..	M.S.[j]	M.S.	M.S.	..	..	M.S.	B.S.
Lebanese University	X	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

-Continued

Table 3. Continued

Country and Educational Institutions	Rural Sociology	Rural Development and Planning	Agric. Extension Education	Agric. Economics	Home Economics	Agric. Co-operatives and Management	Nutritional Science	General Agriculture
DEMOCRATIC YEMEN[k]								
Technical Institute for Agricultural Extension Education	..	..	D.	D.	..	..	..	..
Masir College for Agriculture	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	B.S.
QATAR								
Teachers Training Institute	..	..	..	..	X	..	..	..
SAUDI ARABIA								
University of Riyadh	X	..	..	X	..	..	..	B.S.
King Faysal University	..	..	X	X	..	..	..	B.S.
SYRIA								
University of Damascus	X	..	X	X	..	X	X	B.S.
University of Aleppo	X	..	X	X	..	X	..	B.S.
Tichreen University	X	..	X	X	..	X	..	B.S.
University of Deir Al-Zour	X	..	X	X	..	X	..	B.S.
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES								
University of the United Arab Emirates	..	..	..	X[l]	..	..	..	..
WEST BANK								
Khadouri Agricultural Institute	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	D.
Total and percent offering training in each field	10 (34%)	3 (10%)	14 (48%)	19 (66%)	5 (17%)	9 (66%)	8 (28%)	22 (76%)

-Continued

Table 3. Continued

---

a - D. = Ordinary Diploma usually 2-3 years after High School
B.S. or B.A. = Bachelor of Science or Bachelor of Arts degree.
H.D. = Diploma of Higher Studies usually one year after B.S. or B. A. degree.
M.S. or M.A. = Master of Science or Master of Arts degree.
Ph.D. = Doctor of Philosophy degree.
X = Higher Educational Institute gives emphasis to the specific field but offers no degree in it.

b - Degree given in Economics, Social and Agricultural Sciences.

c - Department is under the School of Education.

d - Degree given in Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology.

e - Department is under the School of Home Economics.

f - Degree given in Agricultural Economics and Extension Education.

g - Degree given in Agricultural Co-operatives and Extension Education.

h - Department is under the School of Economics and Business Administration.

i - Department is under College of Arts and Sciences.

j - Degree given in Rural Extension and Development.

k - In addition to the two higher Educational Institutes in the Democratic Yemen, there is a technical institute for fishery.

l - Degree given in Economics and Agricultural Planning by the Department of Economics in the School of Administration and Political Sciences.

Table 4. Higher Educational Institutions in the ECWA Region, the Presence of Various Departments Related to Social Sciences in Their Respective Colleges of Arts and Highest Degrees Offered[a]

Country and Educational Institutions	Sociology	Social Science	Social Work	Anthropology	Psychology	Economics	Mass Communication	Political Science	Public Administration
EGYPT									
Al-Azhar University	Ph.D.	D.[b]	D.[b]	..	Ph.D.	Ph.D.	..	..	..
University of Alexandria	..	D.[c]	..	Ph.D.	Ph.D.	Ph.D.	..	..	..
University of Assyout	Ph.D.	..	..	..	H.D.[d]	Ph.D.	..	X	..
Ein-Shams University	Ph.D.	X	..	..	Ph.D.	X	..	..	..
University of Cairo	Ph.D.	..	..	..	Ph.D.	Ph.D.	Ph.D.	Ph.D.	..
University of Hilwan	..	..	B.A.[e]	..	..	B.A.	..	..	..
University of Mansourah	..	..	..	..	..	B.A.[f]	..	..	..
University of Al-Zakazik	B.A.	..	..	..	B.A.	X	..	..	..
University of Tanta	Ph.D.	..	..	..	Ph.D.	Ph.D.	..	..	..
American University of Cairo	M.A.	..	X	M.A.	..	M.A.	..	M.A.	..
IRAQ									
University of Baghdad	M.A.	..	..	..	M.A.[g]	M.A.	B.A.	..	B.A.
University of Basra	..	..	..	..	B.A.[g]	B.A.	..	..	..
University of Mousel	..	..	..	..	..	B.A.[h]	..	..	B.A.[h]
University of Sulleman1eh	..	..	..	..	..	B.A.[i]	..	..	B.A.[h]
University of Mustanserlyeh	..	..	..	..	B.A.[g]	B.A.	..	B.A.	..
JORDAN									
University of Jordan	B.A.[i]	..	..	..	B.A.[g]	B.A.[f]	..	B.A.	B.A.
Yarmouk University	X	..	..	..	..	B.A.[j]	..	..	..

-Continued

Table 4. Continued

Country and Educational Institutions	Sociology	Social Science	Social Work	Anthropology	Psychology	Economics	Mass Communication	Political Science	Public Administration
KUWAIT									
University of Kuwait	Ph.D.[l]	..	X	..	Ph.D.[g]	Ph.D.	..	Ph.D.	..
LEBANON									
American University of Beirut	M.A.	M.A.	..	M.A.	M.A.	M.A.	..	M.A.	M.A.
Lebanese University	H.D.	B.A.[c]	X	..	H.D.[g]	..	B.A.[k]	B.A.[l]	..
Haigazian College	X	..	..	..	B.A.	X	..	B.A.	..
Beirut University College	X	..	B.A.[m]	..	X	X	B.A.	B.A.	..
Saint Joseph University	..	..	..	..	..	M.A.	..	M.A.	..
Ecole Superieure des Lettres	M.A.	..	..	..	M.A.	..	..	..	..
Beirut Arab University	B.A.[l]	..	..	..	..	B.A.[h]	..	..	B.A.[h]
QATAR									
Teachers Training Institute	B.A.	B.A.	..	..	X	B.A.	..	..	..
SAUDI ARABIA									
Islamic University of Mohammad Bin Saud	Ph.D.	Ph.D.	..	..	Ph.D.	..	..	..	..
King Abdel Aziz University	..	..	..	..	..	B.A.[h]	..	..	B.A.[h]
University of Riyadh	..	B.A.	..	..	..	B.A.	D.	B.A.	..
SYRIA									
University of Damascus	H.D.[l]	..	..	..	Ph.D.[g]	..	..	..	X
University of Aleppo	..	..	..	..	..	B.A.	..	..	..
Tichreen University	..	B.A.[h]	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

-Continued

Table 4. Continued

Country and Educational Institutions	Sociology	Social Science	Social Work	Anthropology	Psychology	Economics	Communication	Political Science	Public Administration
UNITED ARAB EMIRAES									
University of the United Arab Emirates	B.A.	..	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	..	B.A.	B.A.
WEST BANK									
University of Bir-Zeit[p]	B.A.	..	..	..	..	B.A.[j]	..	..	..
University of Bethlehem[q]	B.A.[s]	..	B.A.[s]	..	B.A.[s]	B.A.[r]	..	..	..
Najah National University	..	..	..	..	..	B.A.	..	..	..
Khadouri Agricultural Institute	..	X	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
YEMEN ARAB REPUBLIC									
University of Sana'a	B.A.[l]	..	..	..	..	B.A.[o]	..	B.A.[o]	..
Total and percent of educational institutions offering training in each field	24 (63%)	10 (26%)	8 (21%)	4 (10%)	22 (58%)	32 (84%)	5 (13%)	14 (37%)	9 (24%)

a - See footnote 1 Table 3 for explanation of degrees offered.
b - Department is under the School of Education.
c - Department is under the Institute of Special Sciences.
d - Degree is given in applied psychology.
e - Department is under the Institute of Social Work.
f - Degree given in Economics and Statistics.
g - Degree given in Education and Psychology.
h - Degree given in Public Administration and Economics.
i - Degree given in Philosophy and Sociology.

- Continued

Table 4. Continued

---

j - Degree given in Economics and Business Administration.
k - Department is under the Institute of Documentation and Mass Communication.
l - Degree given in Political and Administrative Sciences.
m - Degree given in Human Development with major emphasis on Social Work.
n - Degree offered by the Humanities and Social Sciences Department.
o - Degree given in Political and Economic Sciences.
p - In 1977/78 the number of university students was 927, full-time teachers 53 and part-time teachers 9.
q - In 1976 the number of university students was 347, full-time teachers 30 and part-time teachers 30.
r - Degree given in Economics and Accounting.
s - The university gives a combined B.A. degree in either psychology and sociology or sociology and social work.
t - In 1976/1977 the number of university students was 660, full-time teachers 30 and part-time teachers 127.

Table 5. Number and Percent of Students and Teachers in Colleges of Agriculture and Departments of Agricultural Social Sciences and Graduates in the Various Higher Educational Institutions of the ECWA Region

Country & Educational Institutions	Year	Numbers in Agriculture			% of Total University		No. in the Ag. Social Sciences			% of Total Agriculture	
		Students (including Post-Grad)	Teachers	T/S Ratio[a]	Students	Teachers	Students	Teachers	T/S Ratio	Students	Teachers
EGYPT											
Al-Ashar University	74/75	2715	60	2.2	6.5	6.8	..	8		..	13.3
University of Alexandria	74/75	7058	156	2.2	11	14.3	..	15	..	..	9.6
University of Assyout	74/75	4734	107	2.2	16.4	20.6	..	11	..	..	10.3
Ein-Shams University	74/75	6413	161	2.5	8	12.8	638	32	5.0	9.9	19.9
University of Cairo	74/75	5159	208	4	5.9	12	203	10	4.9	4	4.8
University of Mansourah	74/75	2086	12	5.7	9.3	7.1	..	..	..	..	..
University of Al-Zakazik	74/75	2658	55	2.1	26.4	42.6	..	10	..	..	18.1
IRAQ											
University of Baghdad	76/77	3125	144	4.6	9.6	8.3	178	..	..	6	..
University of Basra	74/75	661	30	4.5	9.4	12.2	..	..	..	..	..
University of Mousel	74/75	1434	31	2.2	19.4	26.7	53	2	3.8	3.7	6.5
University of Sulomanieh	74/75	599	35	5.8	26	32.4	..	..	..	..	..

- Continued

Table 5. Continued

Country & Educational Institutions	Year	Numbers in Agriculture			% of Total University		No. in the Ag. Social Sciences			% of Total Agriculture	
		Students (including Post-Grad)	Teachers	T/S Ratio[a]	Students	Teachers	Students	Teachers	T/S Ratio	Students	Teachers
IRAQ - continued											
University of Mustanseriyeh	74/75	..	..	..	..	..	856[d]	32	3.6	4.8	8.7
JORDAN											
University of Jordan	74/75	90	15	16.6	1.9	6	..	2	..	..	13.7
LEBANON											
American University of Beirut	Spring 1978	247	12	4.8	6.6	4	..	4	..	8.5	33
DEMOCRATIC YEMEN											
Nasir College for Agriculture	74/75	78	11	14.1	100	100	..	..	..	..	..
QATAR											
Teachers Training Institute	74/75	..	..	..	..	..	15[f]	4	26.6	2	4.5
SAUDI ARABIA											
University of Riyadh	73/74	369	56	15.2	6.6	8.8	..	..	..	..	..
SYRIA											
University of Damascus	74/75	2473	40	1.6	6.2	6.5	..	5	..	..	..
University of Aleppo	74/75	2340	80	3.4	13.7	62.5	..	..	..	..	..

-Continued

Table 5. Continued

Country & Educational Institutions	Year	Numbers in Agriculture			% of Total University		No. in the Ag. Social Sciences			% of Total Agriculture	
		Students (Including Post-Grad)	Teachers	T/S Ratio[a]	Students	Teachers	Students	Teachers	T/S Ratio	Students	Teachers
SYRIA - continued											
Tichreen University	74/75	952	23	2.4	31.4	32.4	..	..	..	..	..
WEST BANK											
Khadouri Agricultural Institute	76/77	60	..	..	19.9	..	..	..	..	..	..
Total and Percent		43,256	1,236	2.8	9.43%	12.5%	1,983	135	..	4.5%	11%

Table 5. Continued

Country & Educational Institutions	No. of Post Grad. (H.D., M.S., Ph.D.)		% of Ag. Post Graduates		No. of Students Graduated with B.S. Degree or Higher[2]	
	In Ag.	In Ag. Soc. Sciences	With Respect to Total Ag. Students	With Respect to Total University Post-Grad. in All Fields	In Ag.	In Ag. Soc. Sciences
EGYPT						
Al-Azhar University	494[c]	..	18.2	8	498	..
University of Alexandria	847	..	12	15.5	1234	..
University of Assyout	211	..	4.5	19	758	..
Ein-Shams University	790	..	12.3	9.5	1025	..
University of Cairo	180	..	3.5	1.3	1057	82
University of Mansourah	..	..	..	..	200	..
University of Al-Zakazik	222	..	8.4	54	450	..
IRAQ						
University of Baghdad	99	13[d]	3.2	7.8	..	..
University of Basra	..	..	..	..	..	..
University of Mousel	16	..	1.1	26	74	..
University of Sulleimanieh	..	..	..	..	77	..
University of Mustanserieh	..	..	..	..	..	38[e]

-Continued

Table 5. Continued

Country & Educational Institutions	No. of Post Grad. (H.D., M.S., Ph.D.)		% of Ag. Post Graduates		No. of Students Graduated with B.S. Degree or Higher[2]	
	In Ag.	In Ag. Soc. Sciences	With Respect to Total Ag. Students	With Respect to Total University Post-Grad. in All Fields	In Ag.	In Ag. Soc. Sciences
JORDAN						
University of Jordan	..	..	..	..	..	..
LEBANON						
American University of Beirut	101	16	40.9	15.8	15	..
DEMOCRATIC YEMEN						
Nasir for Agriculture College	..	..	..	..	18	..
QATAR						
Teachers Training Institute	..	..	..	..	..	..
SAUDI ARABIA						
University of Riyadh	..	..	..	..	..	..
SYRIA						
University of Damascus	..	..	..	..	182	..
University of Aleppo	..	..	..	..	154	..
Tichreen University	..	..	..	..	..	..
WEST BANK						
Khadouri Agricultural Institute	..	..	..	..	..	..
Total and percent	2,960	29	10%	1%	5742	38

-Continued

Table 5. Continued

---

a - Number of teachers per 100 students.

b - All figures were given for 1973/75 except for the American University of Beirut which covered only the spring semester 1978 and Nasir College for agriculture which covered 1976.

c - Excluding the college for girls.

d - Figures is only for students majoring in agricultural cooperatives.

e - In addition 264 students completed their diploma in Agricultural cooperatives.

f - Figure is only for female students majoring in home economics.

Table 6. Number and Percent of Students and Teachers in Colleges of Arts and Departments of Social Sciences and Graduates in the Various Higher Educational Institutions of the ECWA Region

Country and Educational Institutions	Year	No. in College of Arts			% of Total University		No. in Social Sciences			% of Total Art	
		Students (including Post-Grad)	Teachers	S/T Ratio	Students	Teachers	Students	Teachers	S/T Ratio	Students	Teachers
EGYPT											
Al-Azhar University	74/75	30873	353	1.1	73.7	42.3	..	..	..	..	..
University of Alexandria	74/75	36238	147	0.4	56.5	13.4	3131	31	1.0	8.6	21
University of Assyout	74/75	15156	73	0.5	52.5	14	464	10	2.2	3	13.7
Ein-Shams University	74/75	55719	445	0.8	70.3	35.3	1884	47	2.5	3.4	10.6
University of Cairo	74/75	48348	303	0.6	54.9	17.7	6598	44	0.7	13.6	14.5
University of Mansourah	74/75	11354	40	0.4	50.5	23.9	..	4	..	..	10
University of Al-Zakazik	74/75	4536	17	0.4	45	13.2	..	4	..	..	23.5
IRAQ											
University of Baghdad	76/77	17334	701	4	53	40.3	3055[d]	..	..	19.9[d]	..
University of Basra	74/75	3126	63	2	44.3	25.6	301	12	4.0	9.6	19
University of Mousel	74/75	2104	27	1.3	28.5	16.8	148	3	2.0	7	11
University of Suleimanieh	74/75	380	10	2.6	16.6	9.3	100	3	3	26.3	30

-Continued

Table 6. Continued

Country and Educational Institutions	Year	No. in College of Arts			% of Total University		No. in Social Sciences			% of Total Art	
		Students (including Post-Grad)	Teachers	S/T Ratio	Students	Teachers	Students	Teachers	S/T Ratio	Students	Teachers
IRAQ- continued											
University of Mustanseriyeh	74/75	13699	267	1.9	74	72.6	2282[e]	55	2.4	16.7	20.6
JORDAN											
University of Jordan	74/75	3417	158	4.6	71	63.5	317[e]	41	12.9	9.3	25.9
University of Yarmouk	76/77	281	18	6.4	43.6	36	..	..	..	..	..
KUWAIT											
University of Kuwait	74/75	3726	189	5.1	75.2	65.4	295[e]	40	13.6	7.9	21
LEBANON											
American University of Beirut	Spring 1978	634	86	13.6	17	29.6	480	26	5.4	75.7	30.2
Lebanese University	74/75	12368	56	0.5	73.4	32	2620	14	0.5	21.2	25
Haigazian College	Spring 1978	304	12	3.9	89.4	70.6	74	5	6.8	24.3	41.7
Beirut University College	Spring 1978	430	21	4.9	43.9	56.8	78	8	10.3	18	38
Saint Joseph University	73/74	2060	..	..	69.2	..	610	11	..	29.6	..
Ecole Superieur des Lettre	73/74	815	..	..	73.2	..	310	..	..	38	..

-Continued

Table 6. Continued

Country and Educational Institutions	Year	No. in College of Arts			% of Total University		No. in Social Sciences			% of Total Art	
		Students (including Post-Grad)	Teachers	S/T Ratio	Students	Teachers	Students	Teachers	S/T Ratio	Students	Teachers
LEBANON- continued											
Beirut Arab University	74/75	29731	49	0.2	99.3	84.5	2385	11	0.5	8	22.4
QATAR											
Teachers Training Institute	74/75	476	8	1.7	65.9	9	..	..	..	..	..
SAUDI ARABIA											
King Abdel Aziz University	73/74	3725	303	8.1	92.7	91.8	..	..	..	..	..
University of Riyadh	73/74	3291	299	9.1	59	47	..	..	..	..	..
SYRIA											
University of Damascus	74/75	23770	175	0.7	59.4	28.3	..	8	..	..	4.6
University of Aleppo	74/75	4745	75	1.6	28.3	20.2	893	7	0.8	18.8	9.3
Tichreen University	74/75	1017	17	1.7	33.5	23.9	..	..	..	..	..
YEMEN ARAB REPUBLIC											
University of Sana'a	74/75	1621	21	1.3	93.7	56.8	1021	6	0.6	62.9	28.6
WEST BANK											
Khadouri Agricultural Institute	76/77	150	..	..	49.8	..	..	..	..	..	..
Total & Percent		331,528	3,933	1.2	61.2%	33.7%	27,046	379	1.5	8%	9.6%

-Continued

Table 6. Continued

Country & Educational Institutions	No. of Post-Grad. (H.D., M.S., Ph.D.)		% of Art Post-Graduates		No. of Students Graduated With B.A. Degree or Higher[a]	
	In Art	In Social Sciences	With Respect to Total Art Students	With Respect to Total University Post-Grad. in All Fields	In Arts	In Soc. Sciences
EGYPT						
Al-Azhar University	4901[b]	..	15.9	80	7318[c]	..
University of Alexandria	2506	..	6.9	46	3884	506
University of Assyout	270	..	1.8	24	1111	87
Ein-Shams University	6172	..	11	75	5980	242
University of Cairo	8150	1872	16.9	60	5207	229
University of Mansourah	513	..	4.5	67	772	..
University of Al-Zakazik	119	..	2.6	29	412	..
IRAQ						
University of Baghdad	581	87	3.4	46	..	..
University of Basra	..	..	..	..	319	..
University of Mousel	..	..	..	..	495	23
University of Sullemanieh	..	..	..	..	..	..
University of Mustanseriyeh	..	..	..	..	1300	..
JORDAN						
University of Jordan	584	..	17	92	571	94
University of Yarmouk	..	..	..	..	..	..
KUWAIT						
University of Kuwait	450	64[g]	12	88	421	128

-Continued

Table 6. Continued

Country & Educational Institutions	No. of Post-Grad. (H.D., M.S., Ph.D.)		% of Art Post-Graduates		No. of Students Graduated With B.A. Degree or Higher[a]	
	In Art	In Social Sciences	With Respect to Total Art Students	With Respect to Total University Post-Grad. in All Fields	In Arts	In Soc. Sciences
LEBANON						
American University of Beirut	..	..	..	..	182	..
Lebanese University	1829	..	14.8	100	1214	267
Haigazian College	..	..	..	..	40	3
Beirut University College	..	..	..	..	44	17
Saint Joseph University	179	84	8.7	72	111[illegible]	379
Ecole Superiour des Lettre	90	19	11	49	94	29
Beirut Arab University	193	..	0.6	100	2677	341
QATAR						
Teachers Training Institute	165	..	34.7	100	..	..
SAUDI ARABIA						
King Abdel Aziz University	80	..	2.1	100	..	..
University of Riyadh	2	..	0.06	100	..	..
SYRIA						
University of Damascus	637	..	2.7	84	2668	..
University of Aleppo	..	..	..	..	604	17
Tichreen University	..	..	..	..	..	..

-Continued

Table 6. Continued

Country & Educational Institutions	No. of Post-Grad. (H.D., M.S., Ph.D.)		% of Art Post-Graduates		No. of Students Graduated With B.A. Degree or Higher[a]	
	In Art	In Social Sciences	With Respect to Total Art Students	With Respect to Total University Post-Grad. in All Fields	In Arts	In Soc. Sciences
YEMEN ARAB REPUBLIC						
University of Sana'a	..	..	..	..	9	6
WEST BANK						
Khadouri Agricultural Institute	..	..	..	..	..	..
Total and Percent[h]	..	2126	..	..	36435	2368

a - All figures were given for 1973/74 except for the American University of Beirut, Haigazian College and Beirut University College where figures for spring semester 1978 were used.

b - Excluding the College for Girls.

c - Including the College for Girls.

d - For Iraqi Students only.

e - Includes those majoring in education and psychology.

f - Figure excludes female students majoring in the social sciences.

g - Includes post-graduates with business major.

h - Only for universities which had data on their students and/or teachers.

Table 7. Number and Percent of Students, Teachers, Post-graduates and B.A. Graduates in Sociology in the Various Higher Educational Institutions of the ECWA Region

Country and Educational Institutions	Year	No. in Sociology			% of Total Social Science		No. of Post-Grad. in Sociology (HD,MA, Ph.D.)	% Total	No. & % of Students Grad. with a B.A. Deg. in Sociology[a]	
		Students	Teachers	T/S Ratio	Students	Teachers			No.	% of Total Soc. Sc. B.A. Grad.
EGYPT										
University of Alexandria	74/75	2539[b]	14	0.6	81	45.2	..	..	384	76.3
University of Assyout	74/75	464	3	0.6	100	30	..	..	52	59.8
Ein-Shams University	74/75	853	21[c]	2.5	45.3	44.7	..	..	242[c]	100
University of Cairo	74/75	1141	12	1.1	17.3	27.3	..	..	83	36.2
IRAQ										
University of Baghdad	76/77	206	..	..	6.7	..	..	1.3	..	..
University of Mustanseriyeh	74/75	..	..	..	..	7.3	..	..	..	..
JORDAN										
University of Jordan	74/75	69[b]	10	14.5	21.8	24.4	..	..	22	23.4
KUWAIT										
University of Kuwait	74/75	59	9	15.3	20	22.5	..	..	32	25
LEBANON										
American University of Beirut	Spring 1978	43	3	7.0	8.9	11.5	..	..	..	..

-Continued

Table 7. Continued

Country and Educational Institutions	Year	No. in Sociology			% of Total Social Science		No. of Post-Grad. in Sociology (HD,MA, Ph.D.)	% Total	No. & % of Students Grad. with a B.A. Deg. in Sociology[a]	
		Students	Teachers	T/S Ratio	Students	Teachers			No.	% of Total Soc. Sc. B.A. Grad.
LEBANON-continued										
Beirut University College	Spring 1978	6	2	33.3	7.7	25	..	..	2	11.8
Lebanese University	74/75	..	10	..	71.4	..	..	..	..	..
Ecole Superieure des Lettres	73/74	99	..	..	31.9	..	14	73.7	6	20.8
Beirut Arab University	74/75	1359[b]	1	0.1	56.9	9	..	..	18	5.3
YEMEN ARAB REPUBLIC										
University of Sana'a	74/75	..	4	..	..	66.7	..	..	6	100
Total and Percent		6833	89	1.3	..	..	15	15%	846	50%

a - All figures were given for 1973/74 except for American University of Beirut and Beirut University College which covered only spring 1978.

b - Figures were given for sociology and philosophy majors since often they are combined in one department.

c - Figures were given for sociology and psychology majors.

Table 8. Distribution of Students Studying Agriculture and Agricultural Social Sciences Abroad by Level of Degree Sought[a] and Field of Specialization in Some Countries of the ECWA Region

Country and Year	Rural Socio.	Rural Develop. & Plan.	Ag. Exten. Education	Ag. Economics	Home Economics	Ag. Co-op.	Nutri. Science	General Agriculture
Bahrain (76/77)	..	..	..	..	19	..	..	13
Jordan (76/77) (East Bank)	..	..	..	..	49	..	..	B.S. = 92 M.S. = 1256 T. = 1348
Oman (75/76)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	10
Democratic Yemen (74/75)	..	4	..	2	..	1	..	11
Qatar (76/77)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	B.S. = 5
Saudi Arabia (73/74)	..	..	..	Ph.D = 3	..	..	M.S.= 2	B.S. = 14 M.S. = 8 Ph.D.= 16 T. = 38
Syria (73/74)	1	..	..	1	..	..	..	B.S. = 40 M.S. = 75 T. = 115
United Arab Emirates (76/77)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	27
Yemen Arab Republic (73/74)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	73
Total and Percent:	1 0.01	4 0.03	0 ..	6 0.04	68 4%	1 0.01	2 0.01	1640 95%

a - Degree sought was specified whenever possible. B.S. or B.A. = Bachelor of Science or Bachelor of Arts; M.S. or M.A. = Master of Science or Master of Arts; Ph.D. = Doctor of Philosophy; U.S. = Degree unspecified; T = Total.

Table 9. Distribution of Students Studying Sociology or Other Social Science Abroad by Level of Degree Sought[a] and Field of Specialization in Some Countries of the ECWA Region

Country and Year	Sociology	Social Science	Social Work	Anthropology	Psychology	Economics	Mass Communication	Political Science	Public Admin.	Social Affairs
Bahrain (76/77)	..	..	84	..	62[d]	40[b]	20	..	65[c]	..
Jordan (76/77) (East Bank)	B.A. =42	5312	..	..	..	B.A. = 3	..	B.A.= 20	..	..
Oman (75/76)	..	..	..	..	..	42[b]	3	..	..	..
Democratic Yemen (74/75)	..	..	..	..	..	7	1	..	..	..
Qatar (76/77	B.A. = 2 U.S. = 5[f] T. = 7	..	..	..	B.A. = 10[f] U.S. = 3 T. = 13	B.A. =11 U.S. = 1 T. =12	B.A. = 7	B.A.= 14[e]	5[a]	..
Saudi Arabia (73/74)	..	B.A. = 95 M.A. = 78 Ph.D =110 U.S. = 9 T. =292	..	B.A.= 1	M.A. = 1	..	B.A. = 10 M.A. = 4 Ph.D = 8 T. = 22	B.A.= 4 M.A.= 2 Ph.D= 7 T. = 13	B.A.=8 M.A.=6 PhD =5 T. =19	B.A. = 9 M.A. = 6 Ph.D. = 3 T. =18
Syria (73/74)	..	..	..	..	B.A. = 2 M.A. = 9[i] T. = 11	B.A. =41 M.A. =49 T. =90[h]	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates (76/77)	..	..	..	..	..	63[k]	5	86[b]	26	..
Yemen Arab Republic (73/74)	..	..	..	..	2	74[c]	..	3[b]	..	..
Total percent	49 .07	5616 86		1 1	89 1	331 5	58 0.09	136 2	115 2	18 0.03

-Continued

Table 9. Continued

a - See footnote 1, Table 8.

b - Economics and political science.

c - Administration and economics.

d - Psychology and sociology.

e - Political sciences and economics.

f - Philosophy and psychology.

g - Philosophy and sociology.

h - Law and economics.

i - Education and psychology.

j - Social and religious sciences.

k - Administration and economics.

Table 10. Current Public Expenditure on Education and Percent Allocated to Various Levels of Education

Country & Currency		Current Expenditure on Education (,000)	% Allocated to Pre-primary and First Level[a]	% Allocated to Second Level[b]	% Allocated to University & Higher Education	Year
Egypt	(E)	204,041	..	70.6	29.4	1974
Iraq	(I.D.)	69,420	73.3	21.4	..	1973
Jordan	(J.D.)	11,168	..	79.8	5.2	1974
Kuwait	(K.D.)	74,273	56.3	17.8	10.2	1974
Bahrain	(B.D.)	4,632	67.8	21.6	9.8	1972
Qatar	(Q.R.)	57,056	36.2	31.9	2.9	1972
Saudi Arabia	(S.R.)	3,760,283	43.3	15.9	39.8	1974

a - Includes kindergarten and the first six years of elementary education.

b - Includes high school or secondary education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author extends his deep appreciation to the following persons for their cooperation in responding to the questionnaire and providing some of the needed information for the writing of this report:

Mr. Mohammad Sultan AL-AMIRI
Director of Extension Education
Ministry of Agriculture and Agrarian Reform
Syria

Dr. Mohammad Dougla
Head, Department of Agricultural Extension
College of Agriculture (Abu-Ghurnib)
University of Baghdad
Iraq

Dr. Kasen EL-FARHAN
College of Agriculture
University of Sullemanieh
Iraq

Miss Anahid FERMANIAN
Registrar's Office
Haigazian College
Lebanon

Dr. Foad HADDAD
Registrar, American University of Beirut
Lebanon

Dr. Ahmad KATANANI
College of Economics and Commerce
University of Jordan
Jordan

Dr. Riyad F. Nassar
Dean, Beirut University College
Lebanon

Mr. Haytham SUMAY'AH
Department of Agricultural Extension
College of Agriculture
University of Damascus
Syria

Special thanks go to Miss Samia SA'AB, Chief Librarian, UNESCO, Beirut, who was most helpful by making all the necessary documents of the Library and its facilities available.

Thanks are also due to Mr. George CAMELARIS, Ministry of Agriculture, Cyprus, and Dr. Ahmad HOBKHOO, the Free University of Iran for their cooperation in answering the questionnaire. Originally, it was intended to include Cyprus and Iran in this study; but it was later decided, for practical reasons, to limit the report to countries of the ECWA region.

REFERENCES AND DATA SOURCES

Democratic Yemen, Directorate of Statistics, Ministry of Education. Annual Educational Statistical Abstract 1973-74. (In Arabic).

The Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan, Department of Educational Statistics, Ministry of Education. Annual Educational Statistical Abstract 1975-76. (In Arabic).

International Association of Universities. International Handbook for Universities 1971, Paris, (In English).

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Educational Central Office for Documentation and Statistical Information, Ministry of Education. Educational Abstract 1973-74. (In Arabic).

Republic of Iraq, Central Bureau of Statistics, Ministry of Planning. University and Higher Educational Statistical Abstract 1976-77. (In Arabic).

The Republic of Lebanon, Educational Centre for Research and Development. Educational Statistical Abstract 1973-74. (In Arabic and French).

The State of Bahrain, Directorate of Educational Planning, Ministry of Education. Educational Statistical Abstract 1975-76. (In Arabic).

The State of Qatar, Ministry of Education and Youth. Annual Report 1976-77. (In Arabic).

Sultanate of Oman, Department of Educational Statistics, Ministry of Education. Annual Statistical Abstract 1975-76. (In Arabic).

UNESCO, UNESCO Statistical Yearbook 1976, Paris.

Union for Arab Universities. 1976 Directory of Arab Universities, Dar Al-Sha'ab Prese, Cairo. (In Arabic).

Union for Arab Universities. Statistical Account of Students and Teachers in the Arab Universities 1975. Cairo. (In Arabic).

United Arab Emirates. Technical Office, Ministry of Education and Youth. Educational Statistical Report 1976-77. (In Arabic).

United Nations Economic Commission for Western Asia. 1978. The Present Position and Potential of Rural Development in Three Countries of ECWA Region.

University of Bir-Ziet. Conditions of Higher Education in the Occupied Territories and Principles for Their Development and Support. Palestine Affairs. No. 99, Beirut, June 1978. (In Arabic).

Yemen Arab Republic, Directorate of Educational Planning, Ministry of Education. Annual Educational Statistical Abstract 1973-74. (In Arabic).